

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXVIII

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1921

NUMBER 359

Contents

The Week	199
Editorials	
The Unwisdom of Coercing Japan.....	202
Criminal Justice in Cleveland.....	204
Administration Without Information.....	206
General Articles	
Hapsburg and Horthy.....Eugene S. Bagger	208
Our Village Report.....Bruce Bliven	212
A Tale (Verse).....Louise Bogan	214
Ghosts in the Trade Door.....Garet Garrett	215
Correspondence	218
The Bandwagon	219
Reviews of Books	
Public Opinion and the Steel Strike...W. F. O.	220
Liza of Lambeth.....Francis Hackett	221
Romain Rolland.....Robert Morss Lovett	222
The New Stone Age.....Robert H. Lowie	223
Selected Current Books	224

The Week

NOT the least doubtful and puzzling aspect of the Washington Conference has been the part that France would play in its deliberations. Until recently the tenor of most of the cables from Paris has indicated a certain lack of sympathy on the part of the French government with the emphasis which the American government placed on the consideration of Far Eastern problems. France lacked security and reparation for damages. Europe was in a bad way and could not recover without economic and political assistance from America. The French delegation would, consequently, insist on concentrating the attention of the Conference on European rather than Far Eastern affairs and perhaps even on making any settlement of the Far Eastern question contingent on the consideration of certain measures for the relief of France and her neighbors. If the French delegation adopts these tactics, it will gravely compromise the possible success of the State Department's plans. The security of France is essential, but it is primarily a European problem and it is associated with the attainment of a corresponding security by other European countries. The American government

cannot assume the liability for imposing security from without on an intrinsically unstable and insecure Europe. If the French delegation insists on its assumption of such a liability in exchange for falling in with American plans for the Conference, it will wreck the Conference without accomplishing anything for France.

FORTUNATELY there is an increasing body of French opinion which does not approve of the adoption by the French delegation of such a policy. The *Matin* suggests, indeed, that they play in Washington an entirely different part—the part of disinterested mediator which the American government has unsuccessfully tried to play in Europe. France possesses many advantages for the office of mediator. She has territorial and commercial interests in China, but those interests are not as vital to her as the British interests are to Great Britain, the American interests to the United States, or the Japanese interests to Japan. She occupies the position of a solicitous but friendly outsider who is capable of weighing the conflicting or overlapping policies of the several more interested nations and of working out a sound adjustment among them. As a nation with only an insignificant navy she does not count in the distribution of maritime armaments in the Pacific, but for that reason she has every interest in substituting some body of accepted law for the existing disorder, while at the same time she has enough prestige to make her advice and influence of the utmost importance. Her initiative and support would be invaluable in framing and carrying through a good settlement. Her opposition or even her indifference to a good settlement would enormously increase the difficulty of obtaining it. As a friendly and disinterested mediator she can assume the lead at the Conference and come out of it powerful, admired and influential. But as political traders demanding a quid pro quo in

Europe for every concession which they make to American diplomacy in the Far East, the French delegation will alienate their country from the United States, intensify the economic and social unrest throughout the world and assure their own return to Europe empty-handed.

THERE is one quid pro quo for their friendly participation in the Washington Conference upon which not only France but Italy and Great Britain can reasonably insist. They can and should ask the American government to follow up the Conference on Limitation of Armaments with another Conference on economic and financial relief for Europe. It is plain that while the European peoples are steadily improving in their states of mind, their governments are steadily sinking deeper into the mire of inflation, bankruptcy and social convulsion. Something will break very soon. During 1922 several European governments will have to follow the example of some American states after the Civil War and either scale down or repudiate their debts. It is not possible now to prevent this result, but it is still possible to consider what can be done in order to repair some of the damage, to prevent more damage and to devise financial shock-absorbers for the more solvent nations. This is a business in which Europe can fairly ask the United States to assume the lead. Without American assistance the European nations will recover with painful slowness and after many privations and vicissitudes. Until Europe recovers, American business will suffer from impoverished markets abroad, general social unrest, a constant temptation to speculation and in all probability sharp and incalculable fluctuations in prices.

SHOULD an economic and fiscal conference be called, as some time soon it must be, its authors will need to introduce one essential innovation into their plans. They should issue an invitation to the German government. Without the participation of Germany, such a conference could not accomplish its purpose. As Secretary Hoover declared in a recent speech before the Manufacturers' Export Association, the reparations agreement with Germany is one of the chief causes of economic fever and financial instability in Europe. Unless it is changed there is small chance of stabilizing European currencies. German trade, active as it now is, is not capable of creating sufficient credits in foreign countries to meet German liabilities under the reparations agreement. The German government is unable by taxation to obtain sufficient balances with which to buy the necessary credits in foreign countries. The only way in

which it can even pretend to meet its liabilities is to continue the manufacture of paper marks on a large scale. Until this is stopped European finance will not cease to go wrong; and there is no way of stopping it as long as the present reparations agreement remains in force.

THE announcement that Portugal, Belgium and Holland have been invited to send representatives to Washington upon the same footing as those from China increases uncertainty as to the real objects of the Conference and as to whether the State Department has any clear-cut policy in view. Portugal's interest is confined to ownership of Macao, notorious as the tenderloin district of the Orient. Within the year she has made demands upon China which while small in extent would do credit in quality to any imperialistic nation. Perhaps she is invited in order to get an opportunity to exhort her to be good. But there is danger in assembling too many culprits. They may unite in self-defence. Belgium's interests in China are financial. Acting as an adjutant to France, when the latter in connection with her Russian alliance was aiding Russia's ambitions in the Far East, Belgium made heavy railway investments. Unless Belgian diplomacy has seen new light (as it may well have done because of changed conditions) her inclusion does not increase China's chances of securing justice. In view of the intransigent attitude of France toward Siberia as well as toward Russia proper, it lessens the chances that the Far Eastern Republic will get a fair deal. Holland has, of course, large and, as such things go, legitimate interests in the far Pacific. But their connection with vital issues is so remote that the inclusion of Holland seems either like an act of politeness or as a move in a game of diplomacy. If it is the latter, further developments will show whether the Netherlands interest is to be employed as a Japanese asset or as a foil to British tendencies.

THE British Foreign Office has finally arranged for representation on the part of the Dominions in the Washington Conference. It will commission six British delegates, of whom one will represent Canada, one Australia and one probably New Zealand. The delegates will not, of course, vote separately. They will jointly represent the whole British empire. But they can at least talk separately, and what they say will have an important influence upon the action of the British government. We should have preferred to see the Dominions separately represented in the Conference, as they are in the Assembly of the League of

Nations, but the present arrangement is the next best thing. It would be too absurd to leave Canada and Australia without a voice in a Conference which is engaged chiefly in the consideration of the problems of the Pacific. They are as vitally interested in the distribution of naval power in the Pacific and the political use which is made of it as is the United States.

THE long negotiations between Louis Loucheur, French Minister of the Liberated Regions, and Dr. Walter Rathenau, German Minister of Reconstruction, have issued in an agreement according to which Germany will furnish building materials worth 7,000,000,000 gold marks for the devastated regions. This agreement must be ratified by the Reichstag, the Chamber of Deputies, and the Reparations Commission. Opposition may be expected in the last named body, as Great Britain has already protested against her exclusion from the greatest market in Western Europe, but the Commission can scarcely go on record as throwing obstacles in the way of an understanding so much to be desired both on economic and political grounds. It makes possible an immediate payment on the reparations account by actual transfer of goods. It brings Germany and France into cooperation in respect to one undertaking which the world recognizes as the first and most immediate function of reparation, the restoration of the devastated regions of France.

WHETHER foolish or dangerous is the term to be applied to the new amendment of the Constitution, proposed by the Woman's party, depends upon its chance of success. The amendment provides that

Neither political nor civil disabilities or inequalities on account of sex or marriage shall exist within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

The idea that such disabilities or inequalities can be effectively removed by constitutional fiat is pure superstition. The certainty that such an addition to the fundamental law will jeopardize all special legislation for the protection of women in industry is hard fact. Limitation of hours of employment, prohibition of night work and regulation of work before and after confinement have been sustained by the courts upon physical, social, and economic grounds peculiar to women. They are "disabilities"; they are disabilities "on account of sex and marriage"; and it is highly probable that they will be held to fall under the term "civil disabilities." It is doubtful whether the amendment

can be carried; it is certain that it can be carried only after a long battle. The effort and energy demanded, if applied in detail to removing the discrimination against women in the matter of holding office or in the control of their property and children, would surely have more immediate and less questionable results.

DURING the past summer two cases of infringement of academic freedom have come to light. That of Professor R. T. Kerlin of the Virginia Military Institute is peculiarly shocking. When six Negroes were convicted of murder in Arkansas under circumstances revolting to every elementary sense of justice, Professor Kerlin wrote a dignified and pathetic appeal to the governor of the state setting forth the reasons for distrusting the processes of justice in the case and begging him before sending the condemned men to execution to "take the matter into your private chamber and give it an hour's earnest consideration as before the Eternal Judge." How could a citizen cognizant of the facts better fulfill a civic duty? The Board of Visitors of the Institute passed a resolution on August 20th declaring his chair vacant. Should American education lose the services of this brilliant teacher and honorable gentleman because of his generous intervention in behalf of men of a wronged and helpless race, it will be a standing disgrace to the academic profession.

THE New Republic has already commented on the case of Arthur L. Fisher, Professor of Law at the University of Montana, who was accused by the American Legion of unpatriotic conduct during the spring of 1917. Although the charges were not sustained by a committee appointed by the administration and faculty of the University, the Board of Education rejected resolutions proposed by Chancellor Elliott, commending the Legion for its vigilance and continuing Mr. Fisher's employment on probation, and voted to terminate his connection with the University by placing him on leave of absence with pay during the remainder of his two year term of contract. It appears that Mr. Fisher's case is complicated by considerations in regard to his work as a teacher and by his connection with the staff of *The New Northwest*, a liberal newspaper of Missoula, Montana. In regard to the latter the Chancellor says "in all probability had not Mr. Fisher actively allied himself with the editorial staff of the newspaper known as the *New Northwest* . . . the present case would not now be before this board." Like Professor Kerlin's case Professor Fisher's thus resolves itself into the punishment of a teacher by

higher educational authorities for activity undertaken in fulfillment of his duty as a citizen. Racial prejudice furnished the motive impulse in the former, economic bigotry in the latter. And in neither case is there any remedy until the public mind recognizes that education above all should be a process directed by free men.

THE recall, like the initiative and the referendum, was written on the statute books of certain states by the liberals in the effort to make government more responsive to the popular will. That it is a weapon in the hands of reactionaries also is shown by the campaign in North Dakota for the recall of Governor Frazier, Attorney General Lemke, and the Commissioner of Agriculture and Labor John Hogan. 74,000 voters have signed the petition, action upon which is to be taken at a special election on October 28th. At the same time an amendment to the Constitution is proposed which would cut the ground from under the program of the Non-Partisan League by limiting the issue of state bonds for industrial enterprises to \$7,500,000 instead of \$17,000,000. Laws are proposed by initiative to wind up the Home Builders' Association and liquidate the Bank of North Dakota. If these carry there will be an end to the plans for state ownership of mills, elevators and packing plants, in fact an abandonment of the entire experiment.

THIS attack on the State Administration comes at the moment when after long effort it has succeeded in marketing the entire issue of bonds to provide funds for the carrying out of its program. These bonds were authorized early in 1919. An immediate sale was arranged but was blocked by legal proceedings and when this obstacle was removed, the North Dakota bonds, in spite of their unassailable standing, were refused by all investment bankers. The state had no recourse except to open an office in New York and sell its securities directly to the public. Gradually \$1,500,000 of the \$2,000,000 issue were absorbed. Labor unions were conspicuous in their support of the issue, the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen voting to take \$50,000, the Locomotive Engineers \$100,000, the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers \$50,000. Finally the remainder of the issue has been sold to an investment banking house. The campaign for the bond issue has had the further result of directing attention to the Bank of North Dakota as a financial institution which has as its aim the service of the people, and as such it has been made the depository of funds of

unions all over the country. Thus the Non-Partisan administration for the first time will have the money necessary for the realization of its program. It has won a most difficult campaign through the country at large. Its defeat and recall at home would be a calamity not to be measured by the interests of the single state of North Dakota. It would be the abandonment of the most instructive social experiment in government made by any state, and a disheartening reverse to the forces of constructive democracy.

The Unwisdom of Coercing Japan

MORE than one New York newspaper has published of late a message from its Washington correspondent to the following effect: "The disarmament phase of the Pacific Conference must not be overworked to the extent of creating an American pacifist feeling which will insist upon going further than other countries are willing to go. The power of the United States in securing adhesion of other countries, especially of Great Britain and Japan, to the policy of the open door in China and the abandonment of the policy of concessions, monopolies and spheres of influence, rests upon our ability to outbuild other nations in naval forces. We must keep in reserve this ability as a kind of club. We must be in position to say that if other nations are not willing to abandon an imperialistic policy in the Far East, then we shall carry out our threat to have the greatest navy in the world—incomparably the greatest navy, the phrase sometimes goes. Let us run the armament race to the bitter end and see who will 'go broke' first. If a sentiment in favor of reduction of armaments at any cost develops in America, we shall be deprived of this weapon to enforce limitation. Already other nations are counting on the pacifist sentiment of America to result in a weakening of the American navy while they go on strengthening theirs. The outcome will not only put us at a national disadvantage, but will encourage other nations to pursue that policy of grab in China which carries with it the menace of future wars. Consequently the soft pedal should be used in dealing with the question of disarmament per se."

The above is a blunt, crude statement of what is appearing frequently in the press in a more refined form. Its appearance is so frequent as to suggest something semi-inspired. If not inspired,

it represents a plausible view and one calculated to make an appeal to "red-blooded Americans" and to those who have grandiose views of the United States as a world power. It is plausible because it appeals to those who have a benevolent feeling toward China, who are aware of the history of Japanese and other foreign aggressions, and who feel that it is our duty to act the part of big brother toward a weak and distracted sister republic. The big brother may need, they feel, a big stick to enact his part. And it is human nature that the armament clique and the militaristically inclined, should, consciously and unconsciously, utilize a genuinely altruistic feeling for China for their own ends.

We believe that from every point of view—except of those who have something to gain from war and the fostered fear of war—the idea given out from Washington is harmful and indicates a wrong policy. A limitation of armaments which is secured by even a disguised threat on our part of using our superior economic resources to construct an unlimited navy in case other nations do not agree to restriction, will undoubtedly reduce our immediate burden of taxation, but it will in no way lessen the danger of future war. It is more likely to increase that danger. Existing navies might be scrapped and a naval war begun with converted merchantmen and be continued with resort to a feverish and extensive building of the most destructive naval agencies. The resentment bred in other nations and especially in Japan by recourse on our part to even the most veiled threat of potential force would intensify all the psychological and moral causes of war which now exist.

The fear in Japan of America's superior resources is already immense. Japan does not occupy a very large space in our foreign horizon. America almost fills the entire horizon of Japan. It looms as large to Japan as Japan in turn to China. It is practically impossible for an American outside of Japan to realize how enormous the fear is of the United States, and how fear breeds suspicion and incipient hatred. The dread may seem to us most unreasonable and hysterical. Much of it is so. But it exists, and it is constantly cultivated and employed by the militarist party in Japan to strengthen its hold on public affairs. In connection with the racial discrimination issue it is the chief political asset of the Imperial General Staff. If Japan is forced to agree to a limitation of armaments and to an acceptance of the open door policy in China by a fear that otherwise we shall proceed to build a navy capable of overwhelming her, three results will surely follow.

In the first place, any conceivable limitation

must take place on a pro rata basis. In case of war, Japan would fight on the defensive. With her political objectives in China and Siberia already in her possession and with our distance from Japan and our lack of adequate naval bases in the Far East, she does not require, technically speaking, a navy more than (at most) two thirds as large as ours. Limitation alone would, then, reduce—at the outset—the scale of any possible war and would in the meantime reduce taxation in both countries, but it would not seriously affect the prospect of war.

In the second place, all of the seeds of ill-will in Japan toward America would sprout. Every day the patriotic newspapers of Japan—that is to say almost all of them—would be filled with reminders of American power and American willingness to enforce a dictatorship in the Far East. All the psychological causes that induce nations to engage in a war of "self-defence" would be continuously exasperated.

In the third place, any professed change of policy toward China secured by such a method would be no change of heart; there would be no strengthening of the liberal sentiment in Japan which is necessary to a sincere modification of Asiatic policy; there would be constant effort to find loop-holes and evasions. In short there would be a multiplication of the occasions of diplomatic misunderstandings and international friction.

All this holds good upon the theory that the policy of limitation is carried through to success by means of keeping in the background the virtual threat of overpowering naval supremacy on our part. But the probability is that the method would not succeed. A conference in which this spirit played any large part is doomed to involve a series of bickerings, of manoeuvrings for diplomatic positions, and it would dance to the tune of the old diplomacy. Japan would almost surely find some excuse for withdrawal. And in a dispute conducted upon such a basis, or with such a background, Japan would be likely to get the tacit or avowed support of European nations. A renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance would come nearer the probabilities. A conference conducted upon the basis of forcing to publicity the realities of the Far Eastern situation, accompanied by a whole-hearted leadership by the United States in seeking and planning the reduction of armaments, would render the renewal practically impossible.

This is not an argument in favor of confining discussion to reduction of armaments and relegating to the background the discussion of the problems of the Pacific. It was a wise, a farsighted

act of statesmanship, to combine the two questions. So far as fruitful conference and discussion are concerned the problems of the Pacific are the more important of the two. They are fundamental in importance. But so far as action is concerned, the determination to secure limitation of armaments and the wholehearted will on our part to take the lead and to indicate the way, is the most effective means of securing an honest debate and a just decision concerning Far Eastern problems.

For the United States is in a position of superior strength if it has the courage and wisdom to recognize in what its strength actually consists. Primarily its strength lies in the fact that it is not seeking anything which is for its own advantage, save as an independent, strong and free China and Siberia are to its advantage. Next to that it lies in willingness to forego the advantages of its superior wealth, so far as ability to build for naval supremacy is concerned, in order to promote the prospects of the return of the world to tranquility and order. The policy of Japan in Asia has been so flagrantly bad that it will not stand scrutiny and publicity. If the Conference is conducted frankly without any *arrière pensée* of ulterior coercion of Japan, Japan is bound either to change its policy in Asia or to become internationally wholly isolated. It is near enough to isolation now; it has made bitter enemies of China and Russia; it has its own serious internal difficulties, increased by the staggering load of taxes. If Japan withdraws from the Conference because of refusal to accept a just policy in Asia and that fact is clear to the world, we need not worry about building a larger navy than Japan to cope with the menace. Japan will have underwritten her own fate. The first clear evidence of this fact will be such an enlightenment of English opinion concerning Japan that all the liberal sentiment of Great Britain will join Canada in denouncing the renewal of the alliance. The real strength of the American policy in the Far East consists in the fact that it is the policy of decency, of order and of peace for the world. Anything that disguises and obscures its disinterestedness weakens its prospects of success. The reserved threat of the biggest navy in the world is an immense, a dreadful disguise and obscurity. Resort to it is likely to lead to the failure of the immediate purposes of the Conference. It may even convince the world that we have abandoned the pretence of political idealism and thrown ourselves into that mad scramble for power and lust of gain which has already well nigh ruined the order of civilized societies.

Criminal Justice in Cleveland

ABOUT a year ago certain good citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, were revolted by the palpable and flagrant abuses in the administration of criminal justice in their city. Among other things a municipal magistrate was accused of murder and when he was tried on the indictment the court was rendered helpless and prostrate by obvious perjury. At the same time the "crime wave" called the attention of the community to the large proportion of probable criminals who in one way or another were escaping punishment. These good citizens decided that the reputation of Cleveland and the safety of property and person in that city demanded an attempt at reform, and in order to find out what the scope and the nature of the remedy should be they initiated an investigation into the existing administration of criminal justice in Cleveland. This investigation they placed in the hands of Professors Roscoe Pound and Felix Frankfurter of the Harvard Law School. The Cleveland Foundation sponsored and financed it and its results are now being published in a series of reports. They include a section on the Criminal Courts by Reginald Heber Smith and Herbert B. Ehrmann, on Prosecution by Alfred Bettman, on the Police by Raymond Fosdick, on the Treatment of the Convicted by Burdette G. Lewis, on Medical Science and Criminal Justice by Dr. Herman M. Adler, on Newspaper and Criminal Justice by M. K. Wisheart, and on Legal Education of the Criminal Bar by Albert M. Kales. The final section will consist of a summary and interpretation of the results of the inquiry by Roscoe Pound.

Two of these sections are already off the press and are purchasable from the Cleveland Foundation at 1202 Swetland Building, Cleveland. About November they will be all available in one volume. A final estimate of the value of the inquiry will have to wait until all the separate sections are published and collected, but the sections which are already available enable us to place a preliminary estimate upon the value of the investigation. They provide a sufficient excuse for calling attention to its publication and for venturing some general remarks upon its method and scope.

Americans have small reason to feel proud of the administration of criminal justice in the United States. Its inadequacy is notorious. The volume of crime is greater than that of any other civilized country, and an enormously large proportion of the criminals escape the penalties provided by American law. Spasmodic protests are occasion-

ally raised against some peculiarly intolerable consequence or illustration of failure, but they are convulsive and superficial. They usually exhaust themselves with a few days emotional expression in newspaper headlines or at best with the attempt to throw out of office some corrupt police official, some incompetent prosecuting attorney or some offensive judge. They do not take account of the seriousness of the failure. There is no chance of repairing it as long as the doctors assume it to be personal and fugitive in its origin. Practically all over the country the administration of criminal justice is at best uncertain and tardy and at worst privileged, slipshod or downright corrupt. There is a vast discrepancy between what the American nation seeks to accomplish with its statutes, police departments and courts in the way of protecting the communities against crime and either punishing or reforming the convicted criminal, and what it actually does accomplish. This discrepancy constitutes the point of departure for any thoroughgoing and illuminating investigation. It is vain to consider remedies unless the doctors are agreed upon a diagnosis of the failure which is adequate to explain its nature and scope.

This is what the Cleveland Foundation inquiry proposes to make. On the first page of the first report the authors warn their readers against ascribing "the Cleveland failure to individuals alone, although there has been exploitation by those whose elimination would have a salutary effect. . . . The conditions which make exploitation possible must be removed before permanent improvements can be effected. These conditions are, first, the persistence of a system of criminal justice become obsolete and wholly inadequate through the rapid growth of urban population and modern industrial life, and second, the unorganized, uninformed and socially indifferent attitude of the more intelligent portion of the citizenship, brought about by the concentration on material prosperity to the exclusion of civic life." The investigation becomes, consequently, an analysis of crime, and the detection, the conviction, the punishment and the reform of criminals in relation to the economic behavior and moral standards of the community.

An inquiry with such a scope is clearly of national interest and importance. While it deals primarily with criminal justice in Cleveland and the failure there to administer it in a socially successful way, and while, consequently, it concerns itself largely with a particular group of officials, courts, statutes and practices, its analysis and findings will clearly carry a general application. All over the country no less than in Cleveland, the

American system of criminal justice is "inadequate." It is inadequate not merely because of slack administration but because, as the Cleveland Survey declares, it is "obsolete." It is "obsolete" not merely because it is antiquated, shop-worn, mechanical and lifeless, but because of the transformation of modern urban life by industrialism. This industrialism hampers society in dealing satisfactorily with crime, because it has concentrated the attention of the more intelligent of its citizens upon "material prosperity" and blinded them to the obligations of citizenship. If the inquiry substantiates these statements, it will obviously prove to be as illuminating and as indispensable to a public-spirited resident of Worcester, Grand Rapids, San Francisco or New York as it is to a resident of Cleveland.

The subjects of three of the coming reports indicate that the directors intend to perform a thorough job. One of the aspects of the treatment of criminals in this country, which arouses the gravest misgivings in the mind of an educated man or woman, is the extent to which both existing laws and their administration ignore some of the more authentic results of modern psychology. This phase of the subject will, we infer, be treated by Dr. Herman Adler. He names his contribution to the inquiry Medical Science and Criminal Justice, but by "medical science" he means, of course, mental pathology. He is a psychiatrist and he will consider criminal justice as it is now practiced in the light of the knowledge which has recently been acquired about both the normal and abnormal behavior of the human soul. Equally promising is the report by Mr. W. K. Wisheart on the relation of newspapers to criminal justice. This is a new but extremely important region of inquiry. In the case of any crime or any trial for any crime which has obtained a great deal of publicity in the newspapers, the fact of this publicity introduces a disconcerting element into the administration of criminal justice which profoundly modifies its operation but which is ignored by existing law and practice. Finally Mr. Albert M. Kales's report on the Legal Education of the Cleveland Bar deals with, perhaps, the most difficult and delicate, yet the most important aspect of the failure of criminal justice. If any single group of Americans is more responsible than another for the failure, it is obviously the lawyers. They write criminal law in the legislatures. They administer it as counsel both for the state and the defendant. They expound it from the bench. Perhaps Mr. Kales's report on how lawyers in Cleveland are educated will explain why the profession has so deplorably failed to give to the community tolerable service

in this most fundamental and elementary of their professional duties.

The investigation undertaken by the Cleveland Foundation is, consequently, broadly and courageously planned. It is characterized by qualities which are rare in the contemporary American survey—the qualities of intellectual initiative and integrity. When an American committee starts to investigate some one of the many creaks in the national machine, it usually agrees in the beginning not to be too thorough and disagreeable and not to risk the success and popularity of its report by raising too many or too bitterly controversial questions. They shrink from exposing more of the truth than is in their opinion politically available and desirable. The directors of the Cleveland Survey have fortunately worked on a different assumption. They have assumed, just as a psychoanalyst would assume in treating a case of mental pathology, that unless they can dig up an approximation to the whole truth, their analytic method is of doubtful value. The cure depends primarily on the ability of the doctor to discover the psychological origin of the aberration and the willingness of the patient candidly and fearlessly to recognize and act on the discovery. The only medicine which has any chance of being salutary is the truth—the whole disagreeable, impossible, disconcerting and frequently shameful truth. Modern communities are not accustomed to this kind of medicine. When it is forced upon them their stomachs may be too weak to retain it, but in that case they must not expect to bring knowledge to their aid in repairing their social failures. Knowledge is a hard taskmaster. Those who believe in its authority must be able to recognize its hall-mark and be willing to follow its counsel whithersoever it may lead.

Administration Without Information

THE first snag the Unemployment Conference struck in its deliberations was the result of the lack of adequate and wholly reliable statistics of employment and unemployment. A knowledge of the volume of unemployment was recognized by manufacturers, labor leaders, and professional economists as a prerequisite to the formulation of a sound administrative program. This was the case even before the Conference proceeded to the business of specific recommendations, such as the initiation of a program of public works. If the administration had been in earnest about undertaking on a substantial scale the expenditure

of money for public works; if it had in other words been moved by consideration of the need of the unemployed for work rather than by the fear of raising the tax rate, the Conference would have required a mass of detailed information, showing the total number of unemployed, their geographical distribution, and their classification by industrial and occupational affiliation. Without such an elaborate factual basis, a comprehensive plan of public works could not be undertaken. Everyone knows, however, that statistical material of this character is certainly not at hand in a form available for immediate use. To the extent to which it becomes necessary under such conditions to undertake quick and temporary surveys for the accumulation of information, prompt and effective action is always impeded.

The dependence in this manner of administrative decision on factual support is, of course, a condition not peculiar to the Unemployment Conference. The need for statistical material was recognized so far during the war that before the war was over, we had organized in Washington and through the country statistical organizations, which, in size alone, have probably not been equalled anywhere in the world. Likewise at the Peace Conference each delegation was accompanied by its statistical staff, who almost always worked in close touch with the permanent or temporary statistical offices at home. Here as during the war it was not infrequently the delegation which had the most effective statistical equipment which succeeded most easily in getting what it wanted, because its demands were clear, supported by fact and hence less open to criticism or refutation. Regarded from the angle of sheer accomplishment, the success of the British delegation should in no small measure be attributed to the competence and organization of the men and women who supplied the facts. Instances of much the same nature can easily be multiplied throughout the entire field of public administration. Executive bureaus, congressional committees and incidental conferences or congresses all turn sooner or later to the files of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Census, or some such agency for that information at which the practical business man and the busy legislator often scoff but always use.

In spite of a lack of appreciation of their importance, we have made in this country creditable progress in the development of statistical agencies. Organized often in response to specific administrative requirements, such statistical bureaus have in a short time expanded their functions so as to supply the material for more enlightened public policy and for measuring in various fields the pro-

gress of the nation. The government has moreover called to this service men of the highest professional rank and attainment who, like Carroll D. Wright in the Bureau of Labor, Francis A. Walker in the Census, and Henry C. Adams in the Interstate Commerce Commission, have unselfishly contributed their talents to the public in the face of the smallest of material reward and profound public indifference. This development of public statistics is furthermore not confined to federal agencies. Notably in the states of Massachusetts, New York and Wisconsin, and more lately in others, statistical reports of wide scope and high quality have for years been part and parcel of the executive organization. It is indeed impossible at this time to conceive investigations into questions of social policy in these states which do not begin with the facts collected and published by one or another of the state statistical bureaus.

More than anywhere else in the field of economic statistics, have the last few decades witnessed the growth of continuous statistical series pertaining to the condition of labor in this country. Step by step, through the activities of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in the federal government and the statistical bureaus of New York, Massachusetts, Wisconsin and Ohio in the state governments, there has gradually become available an invaluable collection of statistical material on wages, hours of labor, strikes, employment, retail prices and other phases of labor conditions, which alone has made possible intelligent scrutiny of current tendencies and the adoption of a policy in the knowledge of the facts. In the arbitration of industrial disputes, to cite only one illustration, it would be difficult to conduct the proceedings on the plane on which they are now conducted without the foundation of industrial facts which these public agencies have come in the past few decades to furnish to those who wish to use them. All the while, also, the material improves in quality. The series cover longer periods; the public becomes educated and itself keeps more adequate records; and published reports acquire a wider audience.

In the face of these facts, it would seem that every effort should be made to maintain and even expand statistical services which have been so generally useful and that curtailment should come only when every possible alternative has been tried and failed. Yet only in the past few months federal and state laws threaten the suspension of two government publications which have been among the best of the great number of current public statistical reports issued in this country. Unless ac-

tion of some kind is taken between now and December 1st, the Monthly Labor Review, published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, will be discontinued as the result of an act of Congress withdrawing appropriations for government publications. Likewise it is rumored that the discontinuance of the Labor Market Bulletin for New York State is also under consideration. In both cases the excuse for the action is economy. Both publications are without exception the most important and reliable sources of information on labor conditions now available in this country. They have been so for years and have always been recognized as such by students. Their discontinuance means not only the loss that comes from not having information when it is needed, but also the far greater loss that is the result of interrupting statistical series whose utility consists in their continuity.

The present administrations in Washington and Albany seem to be afflicted with a species of statistical phobia. The symptoms of the disease appear in their most violent and extreme form when the patients are exposed to what are usually called labor statistics. In the State of New York the administration first destroyed the Industrial Commission and then turned its attention to publications. In Washington the procedure has been reversed. First comes the withdrawal of the Labor Review; next may come the dismantling of the Department of Labor. With a Secretary of Labor like the present incumbent, many people are inclined to believe that little harm may result from such a plan. But the friends of progressive government must look to the future. It is their duty to protest promptly and vigorously against this attempt to cripple public agencies, whose only fault is that they have served the people.

The New **REPUBLIC** *A Journal of Opinion*

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1921, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER; DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY ALVIN JOHNSON
FRANCIS HACKETT ROBERT MORSS LOVETT
PHILIP LITTELL

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS, FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

Hapsburg and Horthy

FIUME, Vilna, Upper Silesia, the Burgenland—after all, the expedient so brilliantly improvised by Captain d'Annunzio for the annulment of an international decision is evolving into a bore. Even the most violent coup d'état tends to become monotonous if too often repeated; one could almost wish that if those Central Europeans persist in their pastime of creating accomplished facts they would at least invent some new way of accomplishing them. We refuse to be startled by a mere raid or putsch or insurrection—a peace treaty clause smoothly executed, an award by the Council of Ambassadors promptly obeyed and acquiesced in would have the effect, at least, of something new. And yet there is a subtle and important difference between the tragi-comedy enacted by the so-called Magyar irregulars in the western fringe of Hungary and the three preceding essays in exaggerated self-determination.

D'Annunzio's Fiume excursion was illegal, but it was a frank and single-minded piece of business. Even about the enterprises of General Zeligowski and that monocled savior of Upper Silesian Polish coal miners, Mr. Korfanty, there was a certain naïve, almost honest, quality. These gentlemen were openly engaged in breaking the law, and did not disclaim their purpose; official Polish disavowals of responsibility in both cases may have been disingenuous, but they were at least transparent; they deceived nobody. The game of the "ruffians" who since August 29th have terrorized the peaceful German burghers and farmers of the frontier district, murdered harmless and amiable Austrian gendarmes and customs officials, and hurled defiance at the Ententes both Great and Little, is more complicated.

The surface facts of the case are simple enough. Under the Treaty of Trianon the western fringe of Hungary, called by the Germans, but never by the Hungarians, Burgenland, was ceded to the Republic of Austria. The district comprises a mere trifle of territory which is inhabited by a little less than 300,000 people, all Germans with the exception of about 40,000 Magyars and 10,000 Croats. The motives of the transfer are somewhat obscure. The cession was not solicited by Austria; neither, when offered by the Allies, was it refused. Ethnographically the transfer is justified; historically there is not even a pretext for it, for the Burgenland has never belonged to Austria and its German population descends largely from colonists. Possibly the Allies wanted to compensate Austria for losses elsewhere; possibly they wanted to help

the Republic in feeding Vienna, for the district is very fertile and noted for its dairy industry and vineyards. Probably, also, they wished to drive a wedge of distrust between Austria and Hungary. In this they have succeeded well enough.

The forced cession of the Burgenland evoked tremendous bitterness in Hungary. Austria was denounced, in press and parliament, even by members of the Cabinet that signed the treaty, for stabbing her former partner in the back, for picking the pockets of a fellow-victim. Every device of procrastination was used—and the Magyar government is an expert—to delay execution of the transfer. But at last the supply of pretexts gave out. The Treaty of Trianon was ratified by the National Assembly on July 26th. The two territorial clauses, execution of which was still pending, were the evacuation of the Baranya-Baja region by Yugoslavia, and the evacuation of the Burgenland by Hungary. On August 18th Horthy's troops entered the Baranya-Baja district, where even the Magyar population had implored the Yugoslav government not to withdraw its troops. They knew that occupation by the Magyar army was equivalent to setting up the White Terror which they had escaped under Yugoslav protection; and in this expectation, alas! they were not deceived.

As to the Burgenland, the date of the transfer was finally set for August 29th. On that day Austrian officials, escorted by a small force of gendarmes and Vienna police, crossed the frontier. They were soon attacked by Magyar troops disguised, none too carefully, as "irregulars," and were repulsed with casualties. The new Austrian governor, Dr. Davy, had to flee under protection of an Entente officer. Simultaneously with these proceedings the Hungarian minister at Vienna, Masirevich, notified the Austrian government that the transfer was "interrupted" by order of the Hungarian government. Almost in the same hour a similar notice was served by Count Sigray, Hungarian commissioner for West Hungary, on the Entente officials at Oedenburg, where a military dictatorship was proclaimed by Major Ostenburg, the Hungarian commander, one of the notorious Terror detachment chiefs. For several days skirmishing continued between Austrian gendarmes and Magyar "irregulars" and "insurgents." The latter spread terror wherever they went, ambushing and murdering Austrian officials and police, shooting or flogging peaceful German farmers and looting whole villages. Austrian territory was invaded by the Magyars at several points.

Now one remarkable thing about all this business was that it did not come as a surprise. To be sure, the Hungarian minister had assured the Austrian government on Saturday (the day before the outbreak) that the transfer would be effected without disturbance. But this assurance meant little in face of the fact that the Magyar raid had been advertised in advance by the Budapest press. For weeks previously the Magyar newspapers hinted more or less openly at the desirability and prospects of armed resistance. In the Burgenland itself Magyar agents were spreading anti-Austrian propaganda. In newspapers and pamphlets—the latter often bearing the official stamp of the Hungarian Foreign Ministry,—the population was incited against Austria, “ruled by Communists and Jews,” and exhorted to armed resistance. The movements of agitators, notably of officers connected with the Terror detachments, were registered in the Vienna press. Notwithstanding this publicity, no measures were taken by the Entente representatives in charge, and the Austrian officials were allowed, practically, to walk into a trap.

Moreover, the Austrians, although they had right and all the sanctions of the treaties of St. Germain and Trianon on their side, were not permitted to deal with the situation in an adequate manner. The force sent to take possession consisted of gendarmes and Viennese police. When the seriousness of the situation was realized the Austrian government applied for authorization to employ the Reichswehr. They were met with a refusal. Possibly the Council of Ambassadors, or its representatives, considered that employment of troops would result in a regular state of war, in which Austria, which has honestly carried out her disarmament obligations, would be at the mercy of Hungary, which hasn't. Possibly the fact that the Reichswehr's personnel is overwhelmingly socialistic had something to do with the refusal. Finally the Austrian government, after suffering the humiliation of being attacked on its own territory, evacuated the Burgenland on September 10th. The Magyar “insurgents” remained in control. The proposal made by Czecho-Slovakia and Jugoslavia to march in and restore order was thwarted by Italian jealousy. Meantime the Magyars organized resistance. An army of 30,000 men under General Lehar was concentrated on the Styrian frontier. It took the Allies thirteen days, after the withdrawal of the Austrians, to despatch an ultimatum to Budapest, demanding evacuation of the Burgenland by the insurgents and irregulars.

To this ultimatum the Hungarian government replied that it was very sorry but that it was unable to clear that territory of the insurgents. Now this, of course, is the stereotyped answer for

such occasions, used with a measure of success by other states. Moreover, the record of the Horthy régime for truth-telling is—well, somewhat negative. Nevertheless this time, although appearances were against it, the answer of the Budapest government contained a considerable element of truth.

The fact is—and herein lies the particular complication of the Burgenland incident—that what took place in that district on and since August 29th was not simply a coup d'état, but two coups d'état. But for this complication the whole business would shrink into a mere frontier squabble between Hungary and Austria, easily explained by the desire of the Magyars “to take it out” on their weakest neighbor for all their losses and humiliations. The truth is that the real opponents in the Burgenland case are not Hungary and Austria, not even Hungary and the Entente; but, primarily, Horthy and Hapsburg. The real issue at stake is not possession of this small area of pasturage, corn fields and orchards, but the succession to the throne of Hungary. And the question of Hungarian succession involves the whole problem of Legitimist Restoration. On the Burgenland is fixed today the attention of all the royalist reactionaries of what was formerly Austria-Hungary; of the junkers of Prussia, the clericals of Bavaria, of French ultramontane duchesses, of all the conservative aristocracy between Warsaw and Madrid.

The Burgenland case brings to a climax the feud that for eighteen months has been going on with increasing bitterness between the two great parties in Hungary—the adherents of Charles of Hapsburg and the supporters of Regent Horthy. It is not that the aims of the two parties differ as regards the Burgenland. Both want to nullify the transfer; both wish to save the district for Hungary; both wish to annex the credit for a cheap victory over the defenceless Austrians. The Burgenland furnishes for them not so much a battleground as a racecourse. The question is not so much what to do, but who shall do it.

On August 17th Budapest newspapers published an open letter by Stephen Friedrich, former Premier, Legitimist chief and mortal enemy of Regent Horthy, attacking the government for its cowardly vacillation in the West Hungary issue and declaring that unless the government took action he would. Commenting on this letter, a Legitimist member of the Diet, Mr. Dinnich, close friend of Friedrich, said that his leader wanted to “create an accomplished fact.” The names of Kemal Pasha and Korfanty were freely mentioned. From this moment it was merely a question of who should be in the field first. Both parties had about an equal start. Oedenburg, capital of the Burgenland, was seized by Major Ostenburg, a Legitimist officer;

but Lieutenant-Colonel Pronay, most formidable of the Terror detachment chiefs and Horthy's principal supporter was on the scene, too. So was the Legitimist Friedrich, at the head of an "insurgent" corps and dressed, according to one account, in an American uniform. Another important Horthyist participating in the action was the dreaded Lieutenant Hejjas, with contingents of the Awakening Hungarians, the Black Hundreds organization now completely dominated by Horthy influence. In the first week of the skirmishing the Horthy element preponderated; but the appearance in the field of General Lehar, with his excellently trained and equipped division of 30,000, swung the balance entirely in favor of the Hapsburg interest.

When Admiral Horthy in November, 1919, rode into Budapest at the head of his National Army (the feat was facilitated by the departure of the Rumanians, under Entente pressure, the day before) he was regarded, and probably regarded himself, as a Hungarian edition of General Monk. He went to pains to emphasize that he was acting merely as the lieutenant of his sovereign master Charles, to whom he would cede his power as soon as external circumstances (meaning the Supreme Council) would permit. He was elected Regent on a Legitimist platform. It took only a few months for Nicholas Horthy to evolve from the White Hope of Hapsburg restoration into the black sheep of the monarchist fold. In April, 1920, he exacted an oath of allegiance to himself from the army. Many of the older officers—General Lukachich, for instance, and Colonel (now General) Lehar, refused on the ground that the oath rendered to Charles was good enough for them. From that moment suspicion was growing that Horthy wanted to become king himself.

To be sure, the candidacy of Horthy was not openly discussed for many months, practically not until quite recently. The rivalry crystallized between those who held that the throne was vacant *de facto* and that this vacancy revived the right of the nation to elect a king, and those who maintained that Charles has never really abdicated, or that his abdication was invalid under the constitution. The significant fact is that the one formidable opposition to Horthy's rule, that of the Legitimists, arose from the Right. Opposition from the Left was dealt with by means of the internment camp, torture chamber and machine guns. But these excellent and thorough implements of political suasion were not available against elder statesmen like the Counts Apponyi and Andrássy, and the great aristocratic houses of Esterházy, Zichy, Pallavicini etc.

These representatives of Magyar High Toryism frowned upon Horthy for a variety of reasons. First, they regarded the Regent as a parvenu. Horthy's father was a Calvinist squire; he himself embraced Catholicism in 1920 as a matter of political convenience—some connected even this step with his secret ambitions, as under Hungarian law succession is limited to Catholics. Then, the aristocrats disapproved of his ambiguous attitude toward the King. Still more important, they regarded his régime as a fruit of the revolution. Was not, after all, counter-revolution itself revolutionary in origin? The Regency was begotten in sin; it menaced the sacrosanct concept of legal continuity. If, by dint of a revolution, Horthy could rule, why not another Karolyi, or another Bela Kun? If the line of succession to the throne could be broken, why not the line of succession to entailed estates? But more potent than all these motives was the political sagacity, the class instinct of self-preservation, of the nobles. They began to recognize that the White Terror cannot but lead to the recurrence of the Red. As long as it was merely a matter of executing Communists the Counts did not mind. But the continuation of armed violence, the incredible despotism of the Terror detachments, their bullying, their extortions horrified them. The officers of the Terror army were, mostly, young nobodies; they had nothing to lose but their necks, everything to gain. Free plunder while plunder was good satisfied them. Naturally, the aristocrats took a longer view. The Jewish question furnished another point of conflict. The aristocrats approved of disfranchising the Jews, of keeping them out of the liberal professions and of imposing other restrictive measures; but they drew the line at capturing wealthy Jews and torturing them pending payment of heavy ransoms. This sort of thing attracted unfavorable publicity, and affected the reputation of the country abroad. Moreover, the aristocrats knew from old experience that rich Jews, if properly treated, are most useful allies of reaction.

Thus the conservative nobles had, as the saying goes, their work cut out for them. They could fortify privilege by pretending liberalism. They began to talk of the restoration of law and order, implying the awful admission that law and order were in abeyance. But gradually, as the attitude of the Horthyists became more intolerant, the Legitimist leaders grew more and more outspoken. One of them, Mr. Beniczky, in the session of the National Assembly on April 20th called Horthy's rule "the most cowardly and most stupid military dictatorship in the world." On July 28th in the Assembly Mr. Beniczky launched a most violent

attack on Horthy and his officers, accusing the former of misappropriation of millions of state funds, and charging the government with shielding the murderers and assassins of the White Terror. All the reports of atrocities against Jews and Socialists, formerly circulated by the émigré press in Vienna and borne out by Colonel Wedgwood's report, were now repeated and endowed with respectability by the Karlist politicians. The campaign against Horthy culminated, about August 10th, in a manifesto signed by "Members of the Opposition in the Assembly," enumerating the crimes of the Terror and concluding: "We shall not be intimidated by threats of the torture chamber. There can be no law and order in this country until the victims of the Siofok and Orgovany massacres and the corpses floating down the Danube have been avenged. We have to wipe out those who have sold West Hungary and who have trampled upon the authority of the anointed King."

Horthy's following, on the other hand, is made up of two distinct elements. Its backbone is the major portion of the National Army, led by the two dreaded Terrorist chiefs Lieutenant-Colonel Pronay and Lieutenant Ivan Hejjas. The officers' mafia is the real government of the country; no wonder they will back up Horthy through thick and thin. To them must be added the large number of "refugees" from the lost provinces, members of Horthy's own class, the so-called gentry, formerly owners of the land, now impoverished parasites of an overgrown county bureaucracy. This whole class stands and falls with Horthyism; crowded out, before the war, from the liberal professions and from trade by the more alert and intelligent Jews, today they dominate every quarter of public life. The other section of Horthy's backing, the Farmers' party, the second largest in the Assembly, is not so much pro-Horthy as rather anti-Hapsburg. The majority of this group really believe in free election of a king, but today they are for Horthy because they believe that he will keep the Hapsburg out.

That a break between Horthyists and Legitimists would become unavoidable was indicated in the course of the Charles's ill-starred attempt last Easter to regain his throne. The Legitimists believe that their coup was defeated when on Easter Monday Messrs. Beniczky and Szmrecsanyi were arrested on Horthy's order on the road to Charles's headquarters. Had the two leaders reached the ex-King, they would have induced him to march against Budapest at the head of Lehar's division, and success would have been assured. The Legitimists also believe that Horthy was only too glad when he was compelled by the

Entente ultimatum to ask Charles to leave Hungary. From that time on the Legitimists waged ruthless war on Horthy whose supporters attempted to browbeat them by challenges to duel and by mob action.

Thus the struggle for succession to the crown of Hungary resolves itself into a race between extra-legal, counter-revolutionary military terrorism and constitutional reaction. For the Magyar people there is little to choose between pro-Horthy terrorists and Karlist reactionaries. On the whole—as Professor Jaszi, the great spiritual leader of Magyar liberalism points out in his Vienna exile—the Karlists are more dangerous for the ultimate peace and progress of the country just because they are less brutal and more statesman-like than the Horthyists. They would eliminate the worst abuses and excrescences of the White Terror, but at the same time perpetuate and legalize its essence. Their reign might last; they have the better brains, better schooling, the better connections, both in Entente capitals and with the junkers and militarists of Germany. On the other hand, Horthyism will destroy itself by its own stupid violence; it has pretty nearly reached the end of its rope.

This may be so; and yet there may be a hope for Magyar democracy in a Legitimist victory. For one of Horthy's chief assets is the belief in certain Entente quarters that he deserves support and sympathy because he stands in the way of Hapsburg restoration. In other words, unless the present situation in the Burgenland is bungled very badly by the Horthy government, there is no hope for international action to remove Horthy's terror. He has become a fixture of European reaction. On the other hand, if the Legitimists finish Horthy and restore Charles, intervention by the Little Entente is certain. The police would come and get the big thief after he has gobbled up the little thief. That would be a solution of the Central European tangle; and if it comes off now the name of the Burgenland will be blessed by all true friends of Magyar democracy and progress.*

EUGENE S. BAGGER.

* Since this article was written the Hungarian government has signed, on October 4th, a protocol pledging withdrawal of its "regular" troops from the contested area. This pledge, however, is not taken seriously by anybody except the Allied officers at Oedenburg, obviously gentlemen of more than ordinarily innocent disposition. Further, evidence has been received to show that the Horthy party, recognizing the difficulties of electing its leader king, is supporting the claim of the Archduke Albrecht, son of Archduke Friedrich, to the throne. Propaganda in Albrecht's favor is being financed with the money borrowed on the family estate by the Archduke Friedrich from an American syndicate headed by Mr. J. Leonard Replogle.

Our Village Report

IF you live in a large city—New York for instance—it is readily noticeable that, what with Bolshevism and profiteering and the Ku Klux and the post-war psychosis, the world is speedily going all to smash. After all, though, this will not happen until Our Village notices it too. What has Our Village to report on the State of Things in General?

Perhaps before you ask that question you had better be introduced; for while our manners are rustic, we are the very soul of punctilio. . . . Our Village, then, is on the coast of Maine. Broad ocean breaks on the rocks at its feet; a bright blue, boulder-strewn river flows past on one side (but it moves both ways with the tide and is salty to its source). On the other side is a huge deep arm of the sea, sprinkled with islands and fringed with coves, bays, and here and there a gut (which as all true Norsemen know, is a small body of water with exits fore and aft). It is a bad coast for the mariner; even the children in Our Village must accumulate a great store of sea-knowledge. They must know how much water there is on the reef north of Angel Island at half-tide, and how to avoid the big black rock off Nigger Point which is never revealed except once or twice a year when sun and moon combine in a mighty effort to haul the waters off his glistening bulk. Also, how to watch the horizon when off shore, to turn and scud for home when the gray sou'easter comes roaring up.

With the children, as with all of us, it is a case of learn or drown, for the whole village goes afloat some part, at least, of every day. Our occupation is the sea. When our men are not fishing far out upon the banks, they are tending the inshore lobster pots. In the summer, of course, we take in boarders from the city, and despise them because they make loud noises when excited and become ill on boats in thick weather.

Though our men are so marine, they do not dress in sailorish toggery. The saltiest old captain of us all, as he stands at the wheel of his sloop and shakes the spray from his eyebrows, wears the thoroughly nautical costume of a plain blue serge coat and trousers, a felt hat and white shirt and collar—unless he is fishing, when his shirt may be of black sateen. The only time our men seem nautical is when they are ashore, driving their automobiles—for every village family has a Ford. There is an irresistible deep-water touch about these cars which is quite lacking in our boats. They are apt to be festooned with rope and when the hood is lifted you need never be surprised to see a

useful bit of oakum here and there about the engine. Our men swing aboard with easy grace over the closed side-doors; there are no doors in a yawl.

If you were to "date" Our Village, 1880 would be about right. Preserved by the invigorating sea breezes, here mid-Victorianism is still in full flower. Our furniture is of golden oak, full of curves. On our walls hang colored enlargements of the photographs of our families. We feel that there is no carpet like good Brussels, with plenty of pink and green and brown, and roses the size of mature cabbages. Not long ago wires were strung in from Smithton Harbor, where the shipyards are, for electric light; but after all, there's comfort in a good kerosene lamp with a china shade, its brass work kept shining by those remorseless housekeepers, our wives. As for architecture—our cottages are square and white with little porches and handsome scroll work railings. Down by the stores there is quite a piece of sidewalk, but for the rest a deeply worn path is ample, with whitewashed stones on both sides where it turns in toward the porch.

Now that you know us, ask us anything you like. Would you care, for instance, to know about our politics?

By heredity we are, of course, Republicans. Our politics is like our religion; it is taken for granted, and it would be as improper to start an argument in the back of the general store after supper about the grand old party as to question the virgin birth. Specifically, however, we like this man Harding. He seems sort of friendly, and we guess he wants to do the right thing. True, he plays this high-falutin' golf; but we understand that his doctor makes him.

It's probably just as well that America didn't go into that League of Nations. At the time we were inclined to think it was a good thing, but now all the men at Washington seem to be sort of against it, and they likely know best. These foreigners are a tricky lot.

About Prohibition? Well, Prohibition is probably a good thing. Maine has had it for half a century and it hasn't hurt Maine none. There is some bootlegging, of course; always has been a little. But the boys of the village grow up without seeing a saloon, and there is no wife who needs to look forward with terror to a husband reeling home every Saturday night.

Another problem which hardly exists for Our Village is the Labor Question. In part, this is because our men work for themselves, or son works for father. In Our Village, industry is still in the handicraft stage. Every man's effort is directly productive day by day. If he is building a boat, as

nearly all of us do in the winter, there it is, you see; so many planks laid over the ribs since Friday. The lobster potman brings home his catch of twenty or two hundred after each circuit of his pots. Under such conditions, enormous quantities of work can be accomplished without fatigue. To be sure, a few of us are shiftless, lazy; but Our Village regards these as pathological cases. There's somethin' wrong with a man that don't like to work. We read about these labor unions and strikes in the Portland papers, and though we all work with our hands, our sympathies as a whole are with the employer.

The high cost of living has not meant so much to us as to the city dweller, since we take a great part of our sustenance from the sea. Lobsters may still be caught on the old terms. The village has a few vegetable gardens, and we sell the produce to our neighbors pretty much at pre-war prices. The things which we sell to the outside markets, however, bring far greater sums than before. Some families have been pinched a little by the post-war problem, but there has been no real suffering.

As for the war itself, it is as though it had never been. The village did its part; it sent its sons, and one of them died of influenza at Camp Devens, and is the village hero now. We were in the war with all our might, but with one exception it has left no slightest mark upon our souls. The exception is that we still believe that the Germans are a malignant subhuman race; we believe in all the atrocities, but we are no longer excited about them.

The problem of reckless wild youth, of the cock-tail flapper and the automobile boy, does not exist for us. Our growing girls wear their hair down their backs and help Ma with the supper dishes as of yore.

To be sure, once a decade or so there is a horrid scandal among the adolescents; but no more frequent, nor worse, than they have been any time this past hundred and fifty years. We are not complacent, not even cynical about these scandals. Our Village is still firm in the grip of the dying Puritan tradition. Our elders are eternally unreconciled to the weakness of the flesh which leads full-blooded youth astray. Each new disclosure of Sin comes with as great a shock as though it were the first in centuries.

For the most part, of course, we inhibit our impulses toward wrong. Even the young do so. A psycho-analyst would find as much pleasure in seeking to smooth out our cramped and knotted souls as a laundress in ironing a basketful of crumpled garments. Everywhere among us you find the bright, self-conscious eye of New England, the face which is an alert, defensive mask (and therefore

so often makes its possessor seem more intelligent than he is).

This Puritanism does not prevent us from doing brave and unique things when circumstance falls that way. In fact, once our emotions have flowed out along the line of nonconformity and hardened there, we are as immovable as macadam. In a village not far from ours there is an old man who is a woodcarver. Many years ago, he happened to carve a life-sized butterfly, paper-thin wings and all, painted in its natural colors. For some obscure psychological reason, since then butterflies have been his *métier*. He carves nothing else; hundreds of them; thousands of them, and sells them to the squawking female summer visitors for a few cents.

Somewhat further away there is an island off the coast which does not recognize the sovereignty of the United States. In local tradition the reason goes back to the Civil War and the drafts of '63. After years of parley the inhabitants were persuaded not long ago to pay a school tax and have a teacher from the mainland. But the school tax is too heavy, they say, and the islanders are chafing to be free even from that light bond of loyalty. A stranger landing on that shore tomorrow would stand a chance of rough handling, under suspicion of being a representative of the obnoxious government. Yet these magnificent rebels are good Methodists and Baptists, Anglo-Saxons and sober fishermen. Rebellion is simply the form in which their Puritanism happened to come out on them.

As Anglo-Saxons the islanders are no novelty on the Maine coast. There is not a person in Our Village who does not claim to come of the undiluted breed of the British Isles. If we can judge by faces and names, there are no south Europeans, nor Jews in the village. Only northern stock seems to thrive on these cold and rugged shores. The community is consanguineous in two senses: by race and by intermarriage. Three or four families control the village, and the ramifications of their cousinship are astonishing. Nearly everybody has married into, or out of, the McPhersons, and the first group is as loyal to the clan as the second. Once we got a new school teacher in, a stranger, practically a foreigner, since he came all the way from Smithton Harbor. In his first week he had the unparalleled audacity to spank a McPherson child. At once he discovered that the town was a nest of outraged relatives. They raised a quiet New England uproar, and at the end of the term he was glad to flee for his life, to a community less closely inbred.

Perhaps because we are of one blood, we view our monetary relations with a cheerful serenity which astonishes the visitor, and most of all if he

be from New York, where every man's hand is against your purse. Captain Robertson will bring you over from the railroad in his Ford and charge you two dollars for a twenty mile trip; but he won't ask you for the money as you alight. You must remember it yourself and press it upon him. Otherwise he will let the matter drop for a week or a month. He takes it for granted that you are honest and wish to pay. Anyone who has been in town as much as forty-eight hours can get credit at the village store; defalcations occur almost never.

The remarkable honesty of Our Village is the more interesting because, so far as the outward eye can see, at least, we are not notably religious. There is a church, and services are held on Sunday. Most of the time the service is so arranged as to be a sort of greatest common divisor of the varieties of Protestantism, though sometimes we import a minister of one of the specific faiths. The old churchgoing zeal of our Puritan ancestors has quite departed. It is pleasant to put on clean clothes on Sunday and have a place to go and hear Miss Petrie play the organ and the Gummel girls sing "Come Heavenly Love." But the real religious mania is entirely lacking. Our forefathers would say that the services are disgracefully short and the pews disgracefully comfortable. The Bible is still read in some of the cottages, but with a certain furtiveness, as though we had been told it was no longer quite the right thing.

Perhaps the only aspect of our religious life which remains with its old-time color undimmed, is the playing of church politics. From time to time the village is rent in twain by a fearful feud over church affairs. It may be McPherson against the field, or, most terrible of all, McPherson vs. McPherson. When one of these cataclysms is at its height, our minister is hard put to it to frame his discourse so that it shall not be interpreted as an allegorical taking sides. Since his sermons must always be, as it were, composite photographs of many creeds and therefore slightly blurred about the edges, the poor man knows the pangs of authorship in an aggravated form.

I have said that Our Village "dates" at 1880; but in one respect this is not true. We have become modern as regards a matter which may perhaps be explained with due delicacy by illustrating its obverse. The village postmaster and his wife have been married ten years; and have scandalized Our Village by producing ten children, of whom (as the statisticians would say) ninety per cent are living. With the rest of us, two or at the most three children are regarded as sufficient; and for that matter, the couple who are surrounded by

this rising tide of progeny feel the same way about it. The difference is that they have been somehow unable to orientate themselves in the New Sophistication. When you note that forty years ago eight or nine children were the rule, and that with us, the economic value of the child has hardly depreciated, you can discern progress here, and can roughly determine its rate, as a train traveller estimates velocity, by the rapidity with which the postmaster's offspring whizz past.

At this point I can well imagine an indignant reader — if any — rising to complain. The only usefulness of any study of the American scene, he might argue, is to help one to understand the American problem. These people in Maine are all very well, in their way; but they are out of the current of many real and vital things—things which the rest of America has to be concerned about, whether it will or not.

True enough; or rather, half-true enough. It is no secret that America consists of the cities and the country. In the cities, as I have already said, it is easy to see that the world is coming to an end forthwith. In the country, they do not believe that this is so; and that is a bond between the divergent types of culture in the East, the South and West. If you can understand the Americanism of Our Village, you can understand the Americanism of the country people of other places, even though their surface manifestations are so fascinatingly different. . . . I wonder (as O. Henry might have said) what they are thinking today in Emmetsburg and San Bernardino!

BRUCE BLIVEN.

Our Village, September, 1921.

A Tale

This youth too long has heard the break
Of waters in a land of change.
He goes to see what suns can make
From soil more indurate and strange.

He cuts what holds his days together
And shuts him in, as lock on lock:
The arrowed vane announcing weather,
The tripping racket of a clock;

Seeking, I think, a light that waits
Still as a lamp upon a shelf,
A land with hills like rocky gates
Where no sea leaps upon itself.

But he will find that nothing dares
To be enduring, save where, south
Of hidden deserts, torn fire glares
On beauty with a rusted mouth,—

Where something dreadful and another
Look quietly upon each other.

LOUISE BOGAN.

Ghosts in the Trade Door

IN the economic life of the jungle there is the right to eat and the right not to be eaten. Jungle people, being logical, know that two such rights cannot be reconciled. They accept the law of tooth and claw and think no more about it.

In trade there is the right of the efficient to exploit the world and the right of the inefficient not to be exploited. These two rights are irreconcilable in logic. But man is not a logical animal entirely. He lives logically and thinks mystically. So he says: "Let's find a way to eat and be eaten peaceably."

This naïve proposal originates among the nations that have the leonine teeth and claws. And with no sense of humor they invite to their deliberations a great toothless, clawless nation upon whom all of them have logical designs.

The principal exploiting powers in the world are the United States, Great Britain, France and Japan. They will determine the character and outcome of the Washington Conference on "limitation of armament, in connection with which Pacific and Far Eastern questions will be discussed." Italy is included because she stood with them in a war against the frightful competition of Germany.

Probably the most exploited nation in the world is China. And China is asked to come for two reasons. One is that the conscience of the western world now coming awake is in conflict with its economic necessities. Western nations, especially the English speaking nations, are no longer content to stand in a relation of nature to others, serving themselves by jungle logic. They would have the consent and goodwill of those whom they need to exploit.

The other reason is more subtle. There is a feeling, akin to dread, that the conscience of Japan is not yet awake. Japan is like a dreamer who, on being suddenly obliged to deal with realities, treats them with brutal realism. The efficient world put this rôle upon her, and now she appears to western nations as a spectre of their own past. She says: "We propose doing only what has been done to us. It was your way first." The western people cannot say to her: "But since we did it to you we have found the beginning of conscience in these matters. We would not do it that way again." She wouldn't believe them if they could. She would say to herself that the western conscience is but a name for the fear of Japanese armament. And that cannot be disproved.

Western nations exploited Japan until she was

strong enough to stop it. Now she talks of exploiting China in like manner,—talks of it to the western people in cold, remorseless terms, as to those who know the game and with whom it were hypocrisy to mince words. Formerly the question of an open door in the Far East was one to be settled among western nations. Now it has to be settled with Japan, because, once having found the strength to control her own door, she was soon able to assert rights in the whole Asiatic door. First she demanded equal rights, then special rights, particularly special rights in the exploitation of China, so that now this question of the open trade door in the East tends more and more to become a flat question between the western powers on one side and Japan on the other.

The Conference on "limitation of armament in connection with which Pacific and Far Eastern questions will be discussed" might better be called a Conference to determine and fix Japan's economic intentions in Asia. That is the Pacific problem, and until the Pacific problem is settled, as General Smuts says, there can be no limitation of armaments in the world. Everybody perceives this truth clearly. Japan is keenly aware of it. She is the guest perforce. There is no point in holding the conference without her. And being keenly aware of this she has raised more difficulties than any other participant. She holds for a limited discussion. She wishes not to discuss certain accomplished facts, whereas the western powers are vitally concerned in the consequences of those very facts. But their position is embarrassing, because they themselves have acquired special rights in the Asiatic scene and have accomplished facts of their own to defend. Did they not have special rights in Japan, even the right to make her tariffs, until she had the strength to expel them? Do they not now have special rights in China, including the right to make China's tariffs? Has not Great Britain an accomplished fact in India? Has not the United States an accomplished fact in the Philippines? Who shall maintain that Japan's claim to special rights in any part of Asia is contrary to the way of the world? Well, in these circumstances it was a happy thought on the part of the western powers to invite China. It may be easier to take her part against Japan on practical grounds than to argue international ethics in the abstract with the Japanese.

But what does China think?

She received a separate invitation and was

prompt to accept it in a stately reply, setting forth her desire to "keep on a footing of equality with other governments in this benevolent movement" and her pleasure in the fact that the United States government had not defined, that is to say, limited, the scope of discussion. This would mean that nobody's accomplished facts should be immune. Anything might be discussed. This will not be, of course; but suppose it were. Suppose China should turn upon the world the sublime and gentle irony of her immemorial experience. Let us imagine it.

The Conference opens. The powers speak either collectively or separately as the occasion requires. China speaks alone.

"If the distinguished powers mean to consider limitation of armament for financial reasons, on the ground that continuous competition in navies is a ruinous expense, then China has no part in the matter and cannot understand why she was invited. She does not possess a navy. But if the distinguished powers mean to consider the causes of war, with hope to remove them, so that great armaments may be ultimately dispensed with, then China has something to say."

"We mean to do both," the powers respond.

"In that case," says China, "let the nature of international trade be frankly examined. We suppose that international trade should consist in a voluntary exchange of different kinds of goods between nations for mutual advantage, without coercion or restraint."

"That is the true basis of trade," the powers reply. "One nation produces tea, silk, minerals and fibres; another machinery, textiles and metal wares. These things are exchanged for mutual profit. That is trade."

"Then," says China, "we are at a loss to know why international trade requires the use of navies."

"It is not trade that requires navies," the powers reply. "Rather the greed and selfishness of nations and that spirit of conquest which leads them to attack each other's territory."

"We observe," says China, "that whereas formerly one people aggressed upon another's territory to seize and inhabit it, the modern way is different. What the distinguished powers now require is not the land of other people but their trade, or that which is named trade, though we do not understand it as such."

"Then does it not appear," the powers reply, "that international trade is in fact a substitute for war? Surely economic conquest,—to use the term in its figurative sense,—is a higher form of human activity than physical conquest, and does improve the state of the world."

"Economic conquest has been carried far," says China, "yet never was the world so burdened with armament, never so menaced by war. That is what we are discussing, is it not? It seems to us that modern trade contains the cause of war. First the distinguished powers who engage in economic conquest,—using the term in its figurative sense,—fight among themselves about colonies, spheres of influence, rules of access to the trade of the world and rights of empire. Secondly, it sometimes happens that the people with whom the distinguished powers propose to trade do not wish the benefit and must be coerced to accept it."

"It is a practical world and must be viewed whole in a large way," the powers reply. "It is true, as you say, that the industrial nations have been contentious among themselves and have in certain instances employed measures of coercion against those with whom they wished to establish trade relations. But that is just what we seek to avoid in the future. We hope to establish the principle of the open door for all. Once we do that a very potent cause of war will disappear."

"We do not understand the principle of this open door," says China. "What does it mean?"

"Its meaning is obvious," the powers reply. "It means that the doors to the great markets of the world, particularly those of Asia, shall stand open to all of us alike. It means simply freedom of trade without artificial barriers or special privileges. That, as you can see, is to put trade strictly on its own merits. Those nations which produce goods most efficiently, that is to say, at the lowest cost, will outsell the others in open competition throughout the world. The effect of this will be to make goods cheaper to the buyer. It will tend to make western goods cheaper in China."

"The open door in Asia will cheapen western goods in the markets of China and that in itself is an economic blessing."

"Undoubtedly," say the powers, unanimously. "Human wants are increasingly satisfied by the cheapening of goods."

"The cheaper the better always."

"Certainly so."

"We seem very stupid," says China. "We do not understand it. If the open door is good for the east why not also for the west? In the western world we hear all the trade doors slamming shut. On account of the war Germany owes the other nations of Europe enormous sums which she can pay only by exporting her manufactures. Yet the countries to whom she owes this debt erect tariff barriers against her goods because they are too

cheap. France lays a tariff up to three hundred percent against them to keep them out of her country. We read that Mr. Reginald McKenna, the eminent English financier, says England could better afford to forgive Germany her debt than to receive payment in German goods, because German goods are too cheap; they will ruin everybody's trade. Europe owes the United States a great debt which, like Germany, she can pay only by exporting her manufactured goods. Yet the United States lays a high tariff against European manufactures for the same reason. They are too cheap. What has happened to the principle of the open door among the distinguished powers?"

"That is a different problem," the powers reply. "In the economic development of the world there have come to be surplus nations, so-called. By this is meant industrial countries whose manufactures exceed their own requirements and must be exported. The principal countries in this dilemma are Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States. Their manufactures are very much alike. They all have a surplus of iron and steel products, machinery and textiles to sell. If they try to sell them to each other competitively it is wasteful and ruinous. They only beat down prices in each other's markets, each trying to sell to the other what the other already has more than enough of for itself. Industry is disrupted, labor must be sweated to meet the competition of the cheapest producer, the standard of living in all countries tends to sink to the level of that in which labor is most abject,—and what happens in the end? The absolute surplus, which is the amount in which the total sum of production exceeds the total requirements of all those countries, is not disposed of; so therefore production has to be curtailed and there is depression in trade. You can see that what these countries need is markets beyond their own in which to sell their surplus. They need to sell their manufactured goods to people who do not produce such things for themselves."

"Whether the people want them or not?" asks China.

"That cannot be a serious question," the powers reply. "They want them or they would not buy them."

"But can people always afford to buy what they want?" asks China. "We have seen non-manufacturing people economically impoverished by trade. China has always bought more western goods than she could afford to buy, and is for that reason chronically in debt to the western powers, yet China is helpless because those powers hold her door open by force. They control her tariffs."

"It is China's fault that she has run into debt

in that way," the powers reply. "One phase of trade has so far been left out of the discussion. The manufacturing nations require enormous quantities of raw materials, such as hides, ores, fibres, oil, etc., on which to bestow their high skill labor; also they require food. They exchange their manufactured goods for these raw commodities and for food. That is scientific trade. Now, China is very rich in those resources which the manufacturing countries need, but she has not employed her labor to develop and make them available for sale. That is what she must do for the sake of her own economic future. Then she will stop running into debt. We are willing to supply the capital to build railroads in China, to open her mines and equip them with modern machinery, and so enable her with her abundant labor to produce on a large scale those commodities which we require for manufacture."

"The open door to China means therefore that we shall receive our manufactured goods from the industrial nations and give in payment therefor those raw commodities which they require?"

"That is it," the powers reply.

"It might seem to us," says China, "that this involves an unequal division of tasks. The industrial nations reserve to themselves the preferred tasks of high skill and exploit the labor of other nations like China to perform the drudgery of mining and peasantry."

"Each of us shall do what we do best," the powers reply. "It is what people will. Your neighbor Japan, whose economic position a generation ago was much worse than China's, has made herself one of the great industrial nations."

"That we have seen," says China. "We remember how Japan, then a non-manufacturing nation, was impoverished by western trade. She was flooded with machine-made western goods which ruined her ancient hand crafts. She was helpless, because the western powers, doing in Japan what they do still in China, forbade her to restrict the sale of their goods by means of tariffs, as western nations restrict the sale of each other's goods among themselves. They held Japan's door open by force. Their goods must enter duty free. We then saw Japan sweat her labor to acquire skill in machine production against this western competition. We saw her toil tragically to arm herself. When she was fully armed,—not until then,—she took control of her own door, expelled the western nations from such special trade privileges as they still enjoy in China, laid a tariff against western manufactures and became herself an industrial nation seeking to exploit the labor of non-manufacturing people as hers had been exploited by others. We ask Japan two questions. Could she have got

rich with her door open? Could she have closed her door without a powerful navy behind it?"

"It is not within the scope of the discussion," Japan answers, firmly.

"We think it was the navy," says China. "We are not sure. Perhaps we shall see. You say there is no coercion in trade?"

"There shall be none," the powers reply.

"Each sovereign nation is free to say how it shall employ its own labor?"

"Yes."

"And in what things and on what terms it will trade with other nations?"

"Yes," the powers reply, hesitating. "That is, provided it does not injure the rights of others."

"We perceive," says China, "that we need to develop our natural resources in the modern way; also our skill. Then we shall become rich and powerful. And we comprehend the principle of the open door. We believe in it as you do, not for ourselves, but for others, in order that we may have free markets for our own surplus manufactures when the time shall come that we have any. But first of all we need to have possession of our own door so that we may control the entry of foreign goods which, if they are too cheap, will discourage the beginnings of our industrial life. As it is now we cannot restrict the sale to our people of those foreign manufactures which we must learn to produce for ourselves. We cannot raise tariffs against them without the consent of the powers. Therefore, will the distinguished powers now consent that we shall be free to do as we like with our tariffs, as you do with yours; free, that is, to call China's door its own and say what trade shall pass?"

There is an embarrassed silence. Then the powers speak tactfully. There is much to be considered. Interests of vast importance are involved. The economic structure cannot be made over at a stroke. If China will be so gracious as not to press her proposals to an immediate answer they will be taken up in a helpful spirit later. Meanwhile she will be pleased to receive their most solemn, united assurance that they are deeply concerned in her future and resolved to preserve her sovereign integrity.

"We know how to wait," says China. "But when they come to it will the distinguished powers be pleased to remember that nations great in armament do not wait upon each other's consent to change their tariffs or close their doors?"

The powers bow respectfully, China withdraws, and the Conference on "limitation of armament in connection with which Pacific and Far Eastern questions will be discussed," gets down to hard business.

GARET GARRETT.

CORRESPONDENCE

A Reply to Mr. Beck

SIR: Solicitor General Beck is, of course, right, in his discussion of the Mooney case, to refer to the general truth that it is "futile . . . for a man, through newspaper reports, to pass judgment upon the result of a trial, where the disputed issues were those of fact." So far so good. But when he makes this rule the basis of his "inability to sit in judgment on a result in which twelve jurymen, a trial judge, a Supreme Court, and a Governor of a state alike concurred," he shelters himself behind an unquestionable rule of experience from the responsibility, first, of ascertaining the indisputable facts about a case that has stirred the conscience of the country, and then of acting towards those facts according to the obligation that rests upon leaders of the Bar.

Clearly Mr. Beck is wholly misinformed as to the salient *record* facts in the Mooney case, although those facts (insofar as they had at that time developed) were made the basis of a report by the President's Mediation Commission, which it will take Mr. Beck about ten minutes to read. (Official Bulletin, January 28, 1918, pp. 14-5). Mr. Beck is not asked "to sit in judgment on a result in which twelve jurymen, a trial judge, a Supreme Court, and a Governor of a state alike concurred." So to summarize the situation presented by the Mooney case is flagrantly to pervert the facts. There was no such concurrence; the record is quite otherwise. After conviction by the twelve jurymen, the most damaging testimony against Mooney was completely discredited; after this disclosure the trial judge, instead of "concurring in the result," which had been reached by the jury before this disclosure, formally declared that "right and justice demand that a new trial of Mooney should be had," but found himself powerless to grant such a new trial because of a jurisdictional difficulty; the Attorney General of the state, instead of "concurring in the result" basing his action upon the request of the trial judge, petitioned the Supreme Court, to which the case had gone in the mean time, for a return of the case to the trial court for a new trial; the Supreme Court, in its turn, by reason of a technical requirement of the California code, found itself without power to consider the facts which led the trial judge and the Attorney General to urge that "right and justice" demanded a new trial, and, therefore, was compelled "to concur in the result" by shutting its legal eyes to the most important fact about the Mooney case, namely the discrediting of the state's chief witness; finally, the Governor of the state, instead of "concurring in the result" and allowing Mooney to be hanged, commuted Mooney's sentence solely because of the doubts engendered against the conviction by the new evidence although, with amazing illogic, he saw nothing strange in incarcerating a man for a lifetime despite these doubts.

What makes the Mooney case important (and I have restricted myself to the calmest and most barren recital of the facts, unilluminated by more recent disclosures) is not merely that the verdict in a capital case was discredited by the discrediting of the chief witness, but that the chief figure in the case symbolized "labor" both to the bitter opponents of organized labor as well as in the minds of the workers and their sympathizers. It was this aspect which stirred deep feelings about the case at a time when we were fighting for the vindication of "the moral claims of unstained processes of law." It was this aspect which induced the report by the President's Commission that the circumstances of Mooney's prosecution, in the light of his history and the subsequent history of his case, must not be allowed to give ground "to the belief that the terrible and sacred instruments of criminal justice were consciously or unconsciously made use of against labor by its enemies in an industrial conflict."

As long as Mooney is not afforded a new trial whereby his guilt or innocence may be "put to the test of unquestionable justice," so long will the Mooney case continue not merely an ordinary criminal case, involving "disputed issues of fact," but an incident in a long and bitter industrial conflict. Lawlessness is certainly not abating in this country. It is equally certain that confidence in the rule of law is powerfully undermined by appeal to force, by disregard of law or by indifference to its abuses by the powerful, and especially by those in authority. The claim of the legal profession to be the special guardians of ordered liberty must be freshly won by each generation. The response and the respect that will come to lawyers whenever they do take the lead for law, however unpopular the cause, was amply illustrated when Charles E. Hughes led the fight against the expulsion of the

Socialist assemblymen. Surely the Solicitor General of the United States, when seeking the causes of contemporary lawlessness, should find it incumbent to add his voice of protest against the failure to vindicate the adequacy of Anglo-American law from the distrust which is being sown by a case which, more than any other, symbolizes to millions the perversion of legal machinery as a partisan in the industrial conflict. Noblesse oblige. But at least the Solicitor General of the United States should not add to the injustice to law wrought by the Mooney case by lending the authority of his high office to a reckless misrepresentation of the facts of the case.

FELIX FRANKFURTER.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The Disarmament Conference

SIR: The following letter to the secretary of the forthcoming Washington Conference was drawn up by a representative committee of residents in China, and is being circulated for signature, as far as time allows, in all the larger cities, in this country and in Japan. The canvassers are meeting with great success, as there can not be a thoughtful resident in the Far East who does not realize how much depends on the deliberations at Washington.

K. E. PHELPS,
for the Committee.

Anking, China.

To the Honorable Charles E. Hughes,
Secretary of State of the United States of America,
Washington, D. C.

Sir: It is with great satisfaction that we have learned of the Conference that has been called to discuss the question of the limitation of armaments and other matters affecting the peace of the world, and especially of the countries bordering on the Pacific Ocean. We, the undersigned, representatives of many countries, residing in China, are profoundly interested in all questions touching the welfare of the Far East. With the fearful picture before us of suffering, devastation and death caused by past wars, and with grave apprehension of future wars yet more terrible than those that are past, we write to assure you of our whole hearted sympathy with you in your momentous undertaking, realizing how disastrous would be a war in the Far East upon every constructive religious, educational, and commercial movement in China. We earnestly hope that this Conference may bring about such mutual understanding among nations as shall remove suspicion and distrust, lead to the limitation of armaments, and set forward the Christian ideals of justice and goodwill.

The Aaland Islands

SIR: I cannot help feeling that your mentioning the decision of the League of Nations about the Aaland Islands as successful is rather an unfortunate expression, since you really do not mean that the decision is successful except for the fact that both parties have abided by it. There was nothing else except for both parties to abide by the decision, as it was agreed by both parties that they would do so whatever it might be.

Consequently, whether the decision had been in favor of the desire of the people of the Aaland Islands or whether adverse, as it was in this case, to the desire of the people of these Islands, according to your interpretation of it the decision should be called "successful."

As you know, the people of the Aaland Islands have protested against the decision and I suppose they are trying by whatever legal means they can to get the decision changed. You no doubt also know that Mr. Branting who spoke for Sweden before the League of Nations also protested against the decision. Of course, my viewpoint in this matter may not have much bearing with you, but I cannot but feel that a great injustice has been done the inhabitants of the Aaland Islands and further that the confidence in the ability of the League of Nations to settle justly disputes like the Aaland Islands controversy has been greatly shaken.

I certainly wish, that you would find time to study this matter and later to give your opinion about it in your paper. If I can be of any assistance to you I shall be glad to help if you will call on me.

HERMAN ASPEGREN.

Portsmouth, Virginia.

The Bandwagon

SELL ALL AND GIVE TO THE POOR

"Calvary Church under my leadership has paid out of debt and does not owe a dollar for the first time in ten years. There is no mortgage on our magnificent property, worth at least \$1,500,000, nor is there any outstanding obligation against our endowment funds."—*Rev. John Roach Straton in the New York World.*

"WHAT'S WRONG IN THIS PICTURE?"

In France such men as Briand, Loucheur, Anatole France, Henry Barbusse and other intellectuals are employing all their might and influence to second the energetic efforts of Germans like Wirth and Ebert and Stinnes, and Englishmen like Shaw and Wells and Keynes, and Italians like Nitti and Tittoni and Giolitti to do away with the hatreds born of war and to lead the nations into the paths of tolerance, forgiveness, friendship and mutual helpfulness.

Such men are the true peacemakers.—*New York American.*

LOST IN TIMES SQUARE

In his design for the Times Building Mr. Eidlitz found his inspiration in Giotto's campanile in Florence.—*New York Times.*

WOMAN'S PLACE IS IN THE HOME

"Of the gainful workers of New York City in 1920, 693,096, or 27.4 per cent, were females.—*The U. S. Census Bureau Report.*

AND THE RENTS INCREASED AS WELL

"There isn't a building in New York whose owner cannot present logical, economical reasons why the assessed valuation should not be reduced."—*Stewart Browne, president of the United Real Estate Owners' Association.*

THE UPHILL FIGHT IN TEXAS

"As director of the Young Ladies' Sodality here, I find it hard at times to get new ideas for the entertainment of the young ladies. We know and realize that the Sodality is a religious organization to promote devotion, but I have found that there must also be some social activity or the members will lose some of their interest."—*From a Texas letter to a religious monthly.*

LOVE ME, LOVE MY BOK

"There is no other course left for me, therefore, than to appeal to the fair play of the English public in this attempt to hold me up to public ridicule and fasten upon me an instance of trickery and dishonesty which I denounced in my book. I deeply regret that this should have happened at a time when every effort is being made to create friendly feelings between the peoples of the United States and Great Britain."—*Edward W. Bok in a paid advertisement in the London Times.*

WHY LUG IN FRANCE AND GERMANY?

"Obviously, the foremost nations in the world at the present day are Britain and the regions of the British Empire in which the white race predominates; the United States; France; and Germany..."—*Sir Harry Johnston.*

Public Opinion and the Steel Strike

Public Opinion and the Steel Strike. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. Cloth, \$2.50. Paper, \$1.50.

THE report on the steel strike of 1919 by the Inter-church World Movement commission is now followed by a companion volume containing detailed studies by special investigators. If this second volume does not play so dramatic and important a part in the attitude of the public as did the first report, it will be because we are removed further from the strike by one year. The contents are quite as significant, particularly because of the high standard of the special investigations. The volume contains researches on the use of labor spies, the denial of civil rights, the social mind of the foreign-born employees, the welfare work of the United States Steel Corporation, and the relation of the pulpit and the press to the strike. Each of these topics is a chapter and the authors are the able investigators, Heber Blankenhorn, George Soule, Robert Littell, David Saposs and Karl Wischart. Furthermore, the technical work was supervised by the Bureau of Industrial Research.

The facts presented make a very grave challenge. The arrays of data fall without mercy upon the feelings of readers who have idealized the United States as the home of liberty and democracy and who have thought of lawlessness and oppression as the conditions of other lands. The espionage system of the United States Steel Corporation is described at length. Six hundred daily reports, from one town alone, of "under-cover" men designated by code, as, "Z-16," or "No. 203," are analyzed. The Corporations Auxiliary Company professed to have five hundred such "operatives" at work during the steel strike. The method by which these spies worked into official positions in the unions is disclosed. The manager of this company stated: "When the A. F. of L. organizer comes to Akron he reports to our man."

Affidavits and signed statements to the number of three hundred from fifteen different towns show to some extent how the right of assembling to discuss grievances was denied; how state constabulary rode down men and women pursuing, individually, peaceful errands on the streets; how men and women were arrested and held in jails without definite charges being lodged against them; and how the law was surrendered to company officials. One man was shot as he was taking his four year old daughter from the yard into the house. Another was arrested and charged with "Laughing at the State Police." A meeting hall was placarded, "Closed by the Board of Health." A vacant lot upon which permission to hold a meeting had been given by the owner was found with a "no trespassing" sign on it, and it was reported as having been sold to the Carnegie Land Company. The mayor of Duquesne said: "Jesus Christ himself could not hold a meeting in Duquesne."

Similar evidences of brutality have not been unknown in previous troubles in our fair land. But seldom has the lack of justification for violation of civil rights (if there can be any justification) been shown with such convincing logic. Granting that local laws regulating and prohibiting assemblage are constitutional, what of the wisdom of such a policy? Authorities claim that meetings were prohibited to prevent violence. But Mr. Soule shows, from much evidence, the peaceful conditions where meetings were permitted and the violence where there was interference with such liberties. Not the least interesting feature of

this story of injustice is the description of the technique by which local governments are controlled by the corporations.

The reader may object that he is not getting a fair impression of these phases of the strike but instead is given a selected series of lurid incidents. In answer it may be said that it is a thoroughly justifiable procedure to select for report only the facts of outrages, provided they are facts. Such a record stands on its own merits as a grand challenge to our democracy irrespective of the partiality of the account or of the investigators. It is of course difficult for the reader to tell how true a sample the facts reported are. It is true, however, that the data are not all from one side. For instance, the merits of the welfare work are presented. Instances where mayors permitted meetings are recorded. Although the mind of immigrant communities is shown to be predominantly that of simple peasants from the fields of southeastern Europe, the leanings toward industrial class consciousness of the Hungarians and Finns are reported.

The record as a whole is black though, and it should shame every citizen that such things could have happened in America in the twentieth century and at the successful close of a war fought for idealism and democracy. The pages read more like the account of the social horrors that ushered in the industrial revolution a century and a half ago, and which we are accustomed in our boasting to cite as proof of the progress we have made. The dominant impression from these special studies is that the strike was a fight won by power, power over the press, power over the pulpit, power over government, power over law; and not a strike that was settled after a discussion and consideration of the facts. We know of course that a strike is a fight and not an arbitration proceeding. But public opinion is supposed frequently to swing the strike one way or the other; and in a democracy should we not have faith in public opinion? And may not the decent opinions of mankind bring justice? They may, but there is such a thing as power over public opinion. This fact is the keynote to the report and no doubt is the occasion of the title, *Public Opinion and the Steel Strike*. In one agency of public opinion after another the control and power of the steel companies are shown.

The nearest approach to absolute conformity of an agency of public opinion to the attitude of the employers seems to have been in the press. Four hundred copies of the seven Pittsburgh dailies published during the first two months of the strike were analyzed, and only one example of first-hand investigation of conditions among the strikers by a Pittsburgh reporter was found. The similarity between the streamer headlines and the materials of the thirty full-page advertisements against the strikers that appeared during the first ten days of the strike is shown. Such big display headlines as:

LOOK BOLSHIEVISM SQUARE IN THE EYES AND MEET IT
WITH AN OFFENSIVE and
WITH STRIKE ENDED PUBLIC OPINION WILL FORCE REAL
LOVE FEAST

might with equal probability have appeared as news or advertisement. Every few days for months workers were returning to work by the thousands. The strike was Bolshevik. The strike was instigated by the Germans to capture our trade. Killings by the constabulary were riots. Etc. Etc.

The clergy were divided on the strike. One clergyman

advised "... no man could be more solicitous for those under him than the leaders of these mills are ..." and thought "... they have reached perfection in this way." On the other hand, another clergyman states: "The housing conditions are terrible. The work conditions, the hours of work are absolutely impossible and I think it tends to make the men become disgusted with this country." In many cases it took a good deal of courage for the pastors and priests in the steel area to speak on the strike. The president of one steel and iron company told an investigator and advised notification to whom it might concern: "I am a Presbyterian. If I thought the Presbyterian Church was spending any money on this investigation, I'd never contribute another dollar to the Presbyterian Church." It may be that practically the power of the church over industrial conditions is limited, but it is encouraging to observe the vigor of some individual religious leaders in living and acting according to the doctrine of ethical responsibility of the church for social conditions. It should also be noted that a church organization was responsible for this investigation.

It is curious how little responsibility the American citizen feels for the social conditions in the steel industry or in the mining regions of Mingo and Logan counties in West Virginia. These inhabitants are aliens or mountaineers with queer and strange customs, quite foreign to what is considered typically American. The part of the United States which he includes in his psychological self does not comprise these regions. They might as well be in Mexico or in Russia. In fact, more interest might be taken in them if they were in either of these two countries.

The follow-up work of the commission is therefore urgent. Psychologists tell us that our forgetting is highly selective, that we forget quickly the events that it is unpleasant to remember. The steel strike is a memory rapidly becoming dim. But the strike was settled by power and not by a consideration of the facts. There will be other strikes. The question heard so frequently a decade or so ago, in the era of what the comfortable classes called "muck raking magazines," is just as vital as ever, namely, "What are you going to do about it?" The commission put the matter up to Mr. Gary, the President, the Commissioner of Labor, and to Congress. But the industrial defencelessness of the unorganized immigrant worker remains. The twelve-hour day and the seven-day week are bad for the country. And particularly we should ask ourselves these larger questions: Is the nation helpless before the conditions in a basic industry? Can our democratic society be moved to do industrial justice without the pressure of crisis itself?

W. F. O.

Liza of Lambeth

Liza of Lambeth, by W. Somerset Maugham. New York: G. H. Doran Co. \$1.75.

NOTHING shows less literary taint than this reprinted novel of Somerset Maugham's. It crosses the Thames of combed and curried London to plunge into the jungle of Lambeth. At one end of Westminster Bridge you have an educated England of subtleties and reticences, of refinement and elision. At the other end

you face this primitive, shameless, raw, naked England, this Shakespearian unexpurgated land of savory speech, brutal candor and warm desire. Here hardly less than in the seventeenth century you have the England so often disguised in low comedy but really something so natural, so pungent, so powerfully human, that it can hardly be put into print. Somerset Maugham comes to it not as a humorist but as an unsentimental humanist, looking it in the face. And with no word to show that he stands outside this scheme of life as a cold spectator, with instead a very great power to realize its intense naturalness, he frames one of its most revealing stories in this brief, idiomatic novel.

Victorian England, we are often told, was extremely respectable. A few quaint gestures of this respectability are borrowed by Lambeth. The still-life of fruit under a glass cover is there, and some of the still-life morality—the derision of the "new woman" on a bicycle, and the feeling that "a woman's plice is 'er 'ome." But this comes into Mr. Maugham's narrative as only incidental to the tribal existence that he gives us with such faithfulness. Liza sails into the narrative as a spirited, spunky girl of eighteen, the little friend of all her world. She is at once fiery, indecent, proud, innocent. She can cry, "you jolly well dry up, old jellybelly" and "this is too bloomin' slow, it gives me the sick," (expurgated), and she can blush to the roots of her hair when the strange man grabs her and kisses her in a kissing game. But it is the world that surrounds her that gives Vere Street its pungency.

"It was the dead season in Vere Street as much as in Belgravia, and really if it had not been for babies just come or just about to come, and an opportune murder in a neighboring doss-house, there would have been nothing whatever to talk about. As it was, the little groups talked quietly, discussing the atrocity or the merits of the local midwives, comparing the circumstances of the various confinements." The liveliness of these comparisons is a choral voice in which are mingled the maudlin droolings of Liza's mother, the shrieked laughter of the street, the stolid recrimination of the wives whose husbands have been beating them, the wild excitement of the melodrama, the magnificent gluttony of the Chingford picnic.

But this choral voice is not heard as a discordancy. Where Mr. Maugham is emphatically not a mere naturalist, is in his appreciation of the motives behind these pointed accents of life. It is one thing to see with one's own assaulted eyes the swarming pubs of London, with men and women jammed together as they swill Saturday away; or the swarming nights of Hampstead, with men and women laced together, rows upon rows. What Mr. Maugham does is to induce us to follow Liza into exactly these scenes and to make us see them internally, not externally. So Liza, who falls in love with the burly newcomer who kisses her so resoundingly is very soon not the girl of the gorgeous picnic who says, "Well, I believe I'm boozed." She is the girl to whom this man with a wife and five children says, "Liza, will yer?" and then, shaking himself, shook her to a decision by "a violent, swinging blow in the stomach." Victorian? Not any more than the succeeding scenes in which the tribe gets wind of Liza's love affair or the scene in which her lover's twenty-year wife meets her and, "yer dirty little bitch, you," beats her to pulp.

One can imagine how tasteless and vile these incidents

would be if not understood. It is the genius of Liza of Lambeth that they are penetrated with understanding. Love comes to Liza with the shivering beauty of a new dawn. For her as well as for Jim Blakeston, this bearded man of forty, it is the transfiguration of life. But the game is loaded against them. At first they have each other in the bold anonymity of the parks. But Vere Street begins to know, and Liza begins to be cut. Then they chaff her, with a nudging, badgering brutality that leaves little unsaid. "Liza 'as all the pleasures of a 'usband an' none of the trouble.' 'Blime if I know what yer mean!' said Liza. 'Na, of course not; you don't know nothin', do yer?' 'Innocent as a bibe. Our Father which art in 'eaven!' 'Aven't been in London long, 'ave yer?' . . . 'O me darlin', I love yer fit to kill, but tike care your missus ain't round the corner.' This was particularly bold and they all laughed." They laugh, and she doesn't know what to do. There isn't anything to do. In the camaraderie of their love, (driven now to the winter hospitality of the third-class Waterloo waiting-room), they admit that they're up against it. "So yer see, Jim, we're in a bloomin' 'ole, an' there ain't no way aht of it thet I can see.'" But, like the thick, yellow November fog "which filled the waiting-room, entering the lungs, and making the mouth taste nasty and the eyes smart," their environment poured poisonously in on them, until Jim's wife dug her nails into Liza and "they swayed about, scratching, tearing, biting, sweat and blood pouring down their faces, and their eyes fixed on one another, bloodshot and full of rage."

When Liza returns after this fight to her mother, she is at last on her mother's level. It's then that the old gal gives the young gal plenty of whisky and that the young gal cries, "Buck up, old gal . . . I feel like a new woman now." In the blurred hour of drunken confidences, the mother speaks out of this hidden England. "Yus," went on Mrs. Kemp, 'I've 'ad thirteen children an' I'm proud of it. As your poor dear father used ter say, it shows as 'ow one's got the blood of a Briton in one.'" Liza forgets her trouble as the maternal voice drones to her. She sits up singing, her dress all disarranged from the fight; "her face covered with the scars of scratches . . .," leering with heavy, sodden ugliness. But from this hour she never recovers. During the night, the cold and horrible and lonely night, the anguish of her labor begins, and before she knows anything more, but to the awful droning of her drunken mother and the wild shapes of her two days' agony, she dies.

It is not pathos that Mr. Maugham creates in this masterly end, with the mother and the midwife talking coffins and insurance before the girl is dead, with Jim the lover on his knees by the bedside, calling to her who can't hear. There is pathos but it is inwoven with a plain and terrible recognition of the life force that is beyond pathos, beyond felicity. That force, so raging, so untamed in Mr. Maugham's Lambeth, is not introduced simply for it piquancy and its novelty. It is introduced, one feels, because in Lambeth Mr. Maugham found a something which in modern literature is so consistently ignored. It is the thing that made Hogarth so irresistibly interesting, the thing that flows like rich juice from any slice of Shakespeare's outspokenness. It is something deeply English, or at any rate deeply human. To have understood that and kept faith with it is the triumph of Liza of Lambeth. It is not only racy and colored, it is sincere.

FRANCIS HACKETT.

Romain Rolland

Romain Rolland, by Stefan Zweig. New York: Thomas Seltzer & Co. \$4.00.

THE criticism of Dante excited by the sixth centenary of his death has taken account largely of the extraordinary unity of his conception of life, of the fact that he represents, in the literal sense, a universe. It is toward such unity that great souls have always aspired, and the apparent impossibility of achieving it has been the chief element in that *maladie du siècle* of which the literature of the late nineteenth century is full, and which recognizes itself in such terms as degeneration and decadence. Realism, impressionism, nationalism, pragmatism are all expressions of the tendency to accept the multiplicity of phenomena in a practical world, and to give over as vain the attempt to achieve any synthesis of them. It is the effort to reintegrate the world that gives Romain Rolland his distinction among the writers of today. With dramatic suddenness he was called to testify in his life to the truth of his thought, and like the other exile whose death at Ravenna we are honoring, he was not disobedient to the heavenly vision.

Mr. Zweig's biography is no ordinary one. The outward events of Romain Rolland's life are merely referred to in passing, and the narrative is kept on the high plane of his intellectual achievement. It is clear however from its pages that Rolland was from the first consciously possessed by his enterprise, and that the elements of his training and association contributed steadily to its fulfilment. He was an internationalist in his early enthusiasms for Beethoven, Shakespeare, Spinoza. At the Ecole Normale he was the pupil of Brunetière and the friend of Claudel, Saurès, Péguy, the group which was working for a reaction in literature from the materialism and particularism of the naturalists. He passed through his period of storm and stress, and in his doubt and perplexity he turned to Tolstoi, who accepted him as a spiritual son. Later he was appointed to a fellowship which took him to Rome where he met the great influence of his early life, Malvida von Meysenburg, then an old woman, an unconquerable idealist, whose mind was radiant with the memories of great friendships. He returned to become professor of the history of music at the Ecole Normale, and with Péguy and others to initiate that spiritual renaissance of which they saw France so greatly in need. They published an obscure periodical, "Cahiers de la quinzaine" in which all of Rolland's early work appeared, including *Jean Christophe*. He turned first to the drama, with a series of Tragedies of Faith, written for the people, "to arouse a passionate aspiration toward greatness" in them. He initiated a series of dramas of the revolution. One of these, *Danton*, was introduced by a speech from Jaurès; and *Les Loups*, which represented symbolically the Dreyfus case, was attended at its first performance by the actors in that national drama of atonement, Zola, Picquart, and Scheurer-Kestner. Nevertheless Rolland's plays spent themselves in the void. From this defeat—his marriage broken, his career checked—he fell back into solitude and poverty, and for fifteen years his name was unheard.

During this time he devoted himself to biography. In the drama of the revolution he had sought to represent a great movement, to write an Iliad of the French people, "to exhibit as it were the drama of a convulsion of nature, to depict a social storm." In his biographies of Beethoven, Michael-Angelo and Tolstoi he depicted the individual. In the drama of revolution he had set forth his distrust of the national ideal of victory. He makes Lux, the German

revolutionist, say: "All victory is evil, whereas all defeat is good in so far as it is the outcome of free choice." Now he put forward his conception of individual heroism. "I do not give the name of heroes to those who have triumphed, whether by ideas or by physical force. By heroes I mean those who were great through the power of the heart." And again: "In suffering alone do we rightly understand art: through sorrow alone do we learn those things which outlast the centuries, and are stronger than death." Thus his biographical studies are of men who achieved greatly through pain, who were, in a human sense, made perfect through suffering. He projected biographies of Mazzini, of Thomas Paine, but already the conception of a form which should combine biography and drama, which should in fact dramatize biography, had come to him. In 1897 he wrote the first chapter of *Jean Christophe*, which continued to appear obscurely in "Cahiers de la quinzaine" almost until its conclusion in 1912.

Jean Christophe shows Rolland's passion for unity, his effort to impose a monumental conception on the vast and various flux of human material. He consciously strove to effect a great integration. "The Europe of today," he says, "no longer possesses a common book; it has no poem, no prayer, no act of faith, which is the common heritage of all. This lack is fatal to the art of our time. There is no one who has written for all; no one who has fought for all." In this spirit he tried to draw, in Mr. Zweig's words, "a portrait of an entire generation." *Jean Christophe* is a romance of art, music, politics, philosophy, with at its centre the inner life of an individual soul. It is an international romance. The hero is a German; he lives in Paris, in southern France, in Italy. Indeed, in the characters may be seen allegorical figures of the nations; *Jean Christophe* stands for Germany, *Olivier* for France, *Grazia* for Italy. It would be uncritical to emphasize too much the similarity to *Dante* afforded by this use of allegory to give larger scope and meaning to reality; but there is something of *Dante's* method also in Rolland's use of the actual experience of significant men. *Jean Christophe* was recognized at once as having in part the traits and experience of *Beethoven*. Mr. Zweig has shown that the character is, in fact, a congeries of biographies, *Handel*, *Gluck*, *Hugo Wolf*, *Mahler* and *César Franck*. The conception is one of the most grandiose that has entered into the novel form. The structure is musical as well as epic and the recurrence of themes with different orchestration gives the effect of a heroic symphony. It has been criticised for indifferent literary workmanship in parts, but in this respect, as in all else, Rolland's eye was fixed on the ultimate whole as a goal. "Do not trouble about phrasing," he says, "do not dissipate your energies . . . in straining for artistic effect. . . . Let your heart set rhythm to the words. Style is soul."

Before its completion *Jean Christophe* was recognized as a masterpiece; in 1909 it was published in book form and by translations into English, German and Spanish, it began to fulfil its international mission. And then came the war. In a moment the dream of the United States of Europe which Rolland cherished as passionately as did *Dante* that of a world at peace under the Emperor, was shattered. Rolland's fame had come to him at the moment which his character was ripe for the supreme testing, and he did not flinch. In *Jean Christophe* he had incarnated the genius of France in the reasonableness of *Olivier*. As if with premonition of the spiritual ruin that was to befall Europe he makes *Olivier* say: "I should run the risk of disturbing my soul's peace, which is more precious to me than any

victory. I refuse to hate. I desire to be just even to my enemies. Amid the storm of passion I wish to retain clarity of vision, that I may understand everything and love everything." In a literal sense Rolland accepted the burden of this creed, and through the long horror he remained above the mêlée. His essays, above all his noble letters to *Gerhart Hauptmann*, to *Emil Verhaeren*, to *Woodrow Wilson* sound like echoes from his earlier writings. "I love my country," says *Olivier* to *Jean Christophe*, "I love it just as you love yours. But am I for this reason to betray my conscience, to kill my soul? This would indeed be to betray my country." So in his anguish Rolland exclaims: "We do not choose our own duties. . . . Mine is to save from the deluge the last vestige of the European spirit. . . . Mankind demands of us that those who love their fellows . . . should fight, if needs must, against those they love." And again: "A great nation has not only its frontiers to defend: it has its reason."

To this task, imposed upon him by all his training and understanding and character, he gave himself, with what agony we know from the pages of his last book, *Clerambault*. This is a message to France, calling upon her to lay aside national ambition, fear, hatred; imploring her to follow the path of reason, trust, and service of humanity. But it has a larger mission—to restore the faith of the world in France, the true France so deeply wronged by her politicians and rulers. The healing of the nations must be a mutual task; it depends on a growth of that international spirit of confidence and good will to which mind and heart alike impel us. This is the work to which *Romain Rolland* is called, now as in the days when he wrote: "There is but one heroism on earth—to know life and yet to love it." And to its fulfilment this biography of *Stefan Zweig*, so truly and so ardently interpretative, will be an important contribution. ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

The New Stone Age

The New Stone Age in Northern Europe, by John M. Tyler. New York: Scribner. \$2.50.

WHILE there are several recent books in English that summarize the Paleolithic era, there has been no attempt of late to deal in corresponding fashion with Neolithic man. The invidious distinction made by writers is psychologically intelligible, for the ultimate beginnings of the species must always exert a strong attraction on intelligent readers such as none of the later stages can spontaneously exercise. Nevertheless the *New Stone Age* has an appeal of its own through the fact that during its sway were laid the foundations of what we regard as Civilization in the narrower sense. That is to say, it represents the period of incipient cultivation of the soil and sedentary residence, the domestication of cattle and other economically significant species, the rise of such arts as pottery and weaving.

In the first two hundred pages of his book Professor Tyler offers an acceptable résumé of the salient features of this cultural development. It is an unpretentious treatment of the subject, the several topics being discussed somewhat too discretely, yet this method seems preferable to the over-systematization of a premature synthesis. The author corrects some widely prevalent misconceptions, e. g., in pointing out the difference between hoe-tillage and plough-culture and in explaining that pastoral nomadism does not precede cultivation of the soil, as is still so commonly assumed. On the other hand, it is most regrettable

that Professor Tyler accepts without reserve "the excessively early and totally ungrounded chronology set up by de Morgan and Pumpelly" for Turkestan and Persia, which Professor Breasted, on the basis of Thureau-Dangin's findings, has rejected in the far from uncertain language just quoted. With reference to Pumpelly's scheme the author fails to note that Pumpelly's field archaeologist offered a very much more conservative estimate than the leader of the expedition,—one differing by some thousands of years. Equally unsatisfactory is the facile assumption of a primeval society with maternal descent, a dogma repudiated by every modern American ethnologist. Generally it must be said that when Professor Tyler leaves the domain of material culture he betrays an unfamiliarity with the trend of latter-day theoretical discussion. For instance, it is no longer held that folk-tales are regularly the relics of high and serious myths and the possibility of evolution in the reverse direction should at least be overtly stated.

The final third of the volume contains a good deal of speculative matter, as well as a sort of confession of faith by the author. I cannot help feeling that both might have been advantageously spared so as to leave more space for topics on which definite and objective statements are possible. On the other hand, the final bibliography greatly enhances the value of the book, assembling as it does a variety of properly classified titles, with due regard to articles in periodical publications.

ROBERT H. LOWIE.

Selected Current Books

Ursula Trent, by W. L. George. Harpers. \$2.00.

A novel dedicated to H. L. Mencken. An English woman sets out to follow "advanced ideas."

The Lark, by Dana Burnet. Little Brown. \$1.90.

The romance of a singer.

Niels Lyhne, by Jens Peter Jacobsen. Doubleday. \$2.00.

"The greatest novel of the nineteenth century," according to Ibsen. New edition of the Larsen translation.

Adventures in the Arts, by Marsden Hartley. Boni & Liveright. \$3.00.

Mr. Hartley's emotions concerning modern art in America and other aesthetic topics.

The Book of Life, Mind and Body, by Upton Sinclair. Macmillan. \$1.75.

Mr. Sinclair's prescriptions and counsels concerning the good life, based on his own experience.

The Soul of an Immigrant, by Constantine M. Panunzio. Macmillan. \$2.00.

A South Italian narrates his experience as an alien.

In One Man's Life, chapters from the career of Theodore N. Vail, by Albert Bigelow Paine. \$3.00.

The story of the man who "created the telephone business."

Contributors

EUGENE S. BAGGER is a New York journalist, formerly foreign editor of the New York Tribune.

BRUCE BLIVEN is managing editor of the New York Globe.

GARET GARRETT is the author of *Where the Money Grows* and *An Empire Beleaguered*. He has written financial articles for the New York Evening Post, the New York Times and the New York Sun.

New DUTTON Books

Forty Odd Years in the Literary Shop

By JAMES L. FORD

"It fascinated me," said an editor after reading the ms. It will fascinate any one who is interested in the heart of New York's literary, theatrical and political life—the place where newspapers are made. Five decades of it sketched with amusing, satiric pen will fascinate any one who knows New York. Fully illustrated. \$5.00

The Tragedy of Lord Kitchener

By VISCOUNT ESHER

Lord Esher's membership on many important commissions before and during the war created many and varied contacts with Lord Kitchener. These sketched in his diary with the fresh impressions of the day, have been collected, and enriched from the author's wide knowledge of details that illuminate, and apt stories of "K of K" and others. It is a permanently valuable portrait of one of the most discussed figures of modern times.

With a fine portrait. \$3.00

New Masters of the Baltic

By ARTHUR RUHL

An account of the four new Republics along the Baltic which have recently been admitted to the League of Nations. Mr. Ruhl shows the conditions of these countries and the sharp competition between Russia, England and Germany for economic controlling influence. His knowledge of these countries is intimate and invests his authoritative statements with an atmosphere which makes the book as readable as any volume of travel. \$4.00

And Even Now

By MAX BEERBOHM

Twenty scintillating, delightful little pieces of English, humorous, gently satirical, such as only "the incomparable Max, the idol of the sophisticated," can write.

Limited edition of 1500 copies, \$3.50
Regular edition, \$2.00

The Manhood of Humanity

The Science and Art of Human Engineering

By ALFRED KORZYBSKI

This book meets the need of the man whose mind cannot be satisfied with less than irrefutable facts, yet revolts at the materialism which regards man as animal.

Man is not an animal, says Korzybski. Animals are space-binders, functioning in a world of get and take for the present hour. Only Man draws on the rich heritage of the past, and is responsible to the coming generations. Man is a time-binder, creator and builder, and Count Korzybski gives us a "great blue-print of what should be and may be his future." \$3.00

NEW FICTION

Andivius Hedulio

Adventures of a Roman nobleman under the Empire

By EDWARD LUCAS WHITE

At once the most thrilling novel of adventure published in many a day, and such a panorama of every phase of Rome under the Empire as is not to be found elsewhere in literature.

The vividness with which the reader sees and moves in the scenes of the second century are amazing.

By the author of "El Supremo" which is a brilliant picture of South America unequalled in fiction.

Ready October 15. \$2.00

ANOTHER BRILLIANT PICTURE BY THE MASTER PAINTER OF SPANISH LIFE

The Torrent

By VICENTE BLASCO IBANEZ

Author of "The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse," "Blood and Sand," etc. A romance of the orange groves of Valencia. To be ready October 20. \$2.00

E. P. DUTTON & CO., 681 Fifth Ave., New York